

May 3, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8881

33. Fancher, C. C., Regional Supervisor, Southern Plant Pest Control Region, Gulfport, Miss., Private Communication, October 1, 1963.

34. Fancher, C. C., loc cit, Private Communication, October 30, 1963.

35. Favorite, F. G., "The Imported Fire Ant," Public Health Reports 73 (5), pp. 445-447 (1958).

36. Frear, D. E. H., Editor, Pesticide Handbook, College Science Publishers, State College, Pa., 12th Edition, 1960, 14th Edition, 1962.

37. George, John L., "The Program to Eradicate the Imported Fire Ant," a report to the Conservation Foundation and to the New York Zoological Society, July 1958.

38. Hays, K. L., "The Present Status of the Imported Fire Ant in Argentina," J. Ec. Ent. 51, pp. 111-112 (February 1958).

39. Hays, K. L., et al., "Residual Effectiveness of Chlorinated Hydrocarbons for Control of the Imported Fire Ant," J. Ec. Ent. 52, pp. 1-3 (February 1959).

40. Hays, K. L., and S. B. Hays, "Food Habits of *Solenopsis saevissima* var. *richteri* Forel," J. Ec. Ent. 52, pp. 455-457 (June 1959).

41. Hays, S. B., and F. S. Arant, "Insecticidal Baits for Control of the Imported Fire Ant," J. Ec. Ent. 53, pp. 188-191 (April 1960).

42. Hays, K. L., "Ecological Observations on the Imported Fire Ant *Solenopsis saevissima* var. *richteri* Forel in Alabama," J. Ala. Acad. of Science 30 (April 1959).

43. Hensley, S. D., et al., "Effects of Insecticides on the Predaceous Arthropod Fauna of Louisiana Sugar Cane Fields," J. Ec. Ent. 54, pp. 146-149 (February 1961).

44. Jenkins, J. H., "Some Observations on the New Fire Ant *Bait* in Relation to Wildlife," presented at S. E. Branch, Ent. Soc. of America, Jackson, Miss., (January 29-31, 1963).

45. Karo, R., V. J. Derbes, R. Jung, A.M.A. Arch. Dermatol 75, p. 475 (1957).

46. Lofgren, C. S., et al., "Imported Fire Ant Bait Studies: The Evaluation of Various Food Materials," J. Ec. Ent. 54, pp. 1096-1100 (Dec. 1961).

47. Lofgren, C. S., et al., "Heptachlor and Heptachlor Epoxide Residues in Truck Crops," J. Ec. Ent. 54, pp. 1264-1265 (Dec. 1961).

48. Lofgren, C. S., et al., "Imported Fire Ant Toxic Bait Studies: GC-1283, a Promising Toxicant?" J. Ec. Ent. 55, pp. 405-407 (June 1962).

49. Lofgren, C. S., et al., "Residual Studies in Connection with Successive Application of Heptachlor for Imported Fire Ant Eradication," Ag. & Food Chem. 10, pp. 5-7 (Jan.-Feb. 1962).

50. Lofgren, C. S., et al., "Imported Fire Ant Bait Studies: Evaluation of Carriers for Oil Baits," J. Ec. Ent. 56, pp. 62-66 (Feb. 1963).

51. Lofgren, C. S., et al., "Control of Imported Fire Ants with Chlordane," submitted to J. Ec. Ent. (June 24, 1963).

52. Lofgren, C. S., et al., "The Effectiveness of Heptachlor and Chlordane on the Foraging Activity of Imported Fire Ants," submitted to J. Ec. Ent. (June 24, 1963).

53. Lofgren, C. S., et al., "Imported Fire Ant Toxic Bait Studies: Further Tests With Granulated Mirex-Soybean Oil Bait," submitted to J. Ec. Ent. (Sept. 12, 1963).

54. Lofgren, C. S., et al., "Laboratory Investigation of Soil Insecticides Against the Imported Fire Ant," submitted to J. Ec. Ent. (Aug. 26, 1963).

55. Lyle, Clay, and Irma Fortune, "Notes on an Imported Fire Ant," Jour. Econ. Ent. 41 (5), pp. 833-834 (1948).

56. Newsom, L. D., et al., "Effect of the Fire Ant Eradication Program on the Fauna of Rice Fields," Insect Conditions in Louisiana 2, pp. 8-14 (1959).

57. Parrish, Henry M., "Analysis of 460 Fatalities From Venomous Animals in the United States," Amer. Journal of the Medical Sciences, 245 (2), pp. 129-140 (February 1963).

58. Riberio, J. H. Carneiro. Article in *Agronomia, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil*, vol. 13, No. 3-4, pp. 227-231 (1954).

59. Ruffin, W. A., Supervisor, Div. of Plant Ind., D/A, Ala., private communication, September 11, 1963.

60. Wilson, Edward O., and J. H. Eads. A report on the Imported Fire Ant *Solenopsis saevissima* var. *richteri* Forel in Alabama. Alabama Department of Conservation, 54 pages.

61. Wilson, E. O., "The Fire Ant," *Scientific American*, pp. 36-41 (Mar. 1958).

62. Wilson, E. O., Biological Laboratories, Harvard Univ., Private Communication, November 20, 1963.

63. Wilson, E. O., Prepared statement and read it before U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations on October 8, 1963.

64. Yates, Harold, and M. R. Smith, "First Report of Crop Damage by the Imported Fire Ant," (Rep. from API Gulf Coast Sub Sta. Assistant Superintendent and USDA representative).

65. York, H. H., Project Forester of Alabama. Memorandum: "Fire Ants." Mimeographed report, 3 p. (1949).

## THE PRESIDENT'S STAND IN

## VIETNAM

(Mr. WAGGONER (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I have, on a number of occasions recently, congratulated the President on the strong stand that has now been adopted in Vietnam. In my opinion, the posture we have now taken is the most positive action expressing our determination to halt the growth and expansion of communism, to come from the White House in a great number of years.

It is not surprising that the so-called intellectuals who speak so volubly for the left are heated in their denunciation of this position of strength. I think it is incumbent upon those of us who believe that we have backtracked, apologized and negotiated long enough, to speak up in defense of the President and encourage him to continue the policy we have now adopted.

In this context, I would like to insert here in the RECORD a recent editorial from the Shreveport Times that expresses my sentiments and those, I believe, of the majority of all Americans.

## IN THE NAME OF GOD \* \* \*

Secretary of State Dean Rusk's denunciation of "intellectuals" and "educated men" who are conducting a nationwide propaganda drive against President Johnson's course in Vietnam is the strongest, the most encouraging and the most commendable utterance in behalf of standing up against communism that has come from the State Department since cancer forced John Foster Dulles out of the Secretaryship in the late 1950's.

What Mr. Rusk said, in his speech before the American Society of International Law in Washington, could not and would not have been said without full approval of President Johnson. Thus it not only carries added weight in its national and international importance, but brings new commendation to the President for his determination not only to fight in southeast Asia but to stand up against those in his own country who attack him when they should be supporting him.

Further, Mr. Rusk knows whereof he speaks. In the 1940's he was a member of the Institute of Pacific Relations. It fostered propaganda helping the Communist cause in China, then a free republic under Chiang Kai-shek. It pictured the Chinese Communist as "simple farmers" simply trying to elevate their living standards. It was under this and similar propaganda that the Communists took over China and forced the government of Chiang Kai-shek—our staunch ally throughout World War II—into exile on Formosa. It was as a result of these philosophies that the Korean war was fought; and, because it was fought on a no-win basis, Communist China became the second strongest Communist power in the world.

It was from so-called intellectuals and educated men that the philosophies came which made possible the terrible international mess of which Mr. Rusk speaks today. It is to his full credit that he does speak today—with President Johnson's approval; it is also to his credit that he saw the error of his original ways even before the Korean war came. As it approached he denounced Red China as a menace to the world, but it was too late then.

But the issue now is what is happening today and not what was happening then. If we permit a repetition now of the events of the 1940's—and earlier in other ways—then freedom for nations may, indeed, be on its last legs around the earth.

Mr. Rusk did not use the word "clergy" nor did he use the phrase "college faculty members." But his attack is directly on segments of these groups, for it is from within them that "educated men" conduct their anti-Johnson—and, in our opinion, un-American—propaganda today. This does not mean that "the clergy" of the Nation in all-embracing sense, or college faculty people in an all-embracing sense, come under Mr. Rusk's criticism or ours.

But it does mean that the ever increasing effort to encourage backing down from communism by the United States—as has been the course of this country since 1961, with one or two temporary and quickly abandoned "strong stands" intermingled—too often is agitated and urged on fundamentally from within the clergy and within the colleges at the faculty level—with plenty of help from other sources, including Communist or pro-Communist sources at times.

Shortly before Mr. Rusk delivered his speech, a full page advertisement appeared in the New York Times stating that it was sponsored by 2,000 clergymen. We did not count the names printed in it but the total could have been that number. It was a demand on President Johnson, starting out with these words: "In the name of God get us out of Vietnam."

Fundamentally this full page advertisement also was an appeal to other clergymen to send in their names—for use in future ads—in support of the plea, "In the name of God get us out of Vietnam." The result was that 14,000 additional clergymen mailed in their names. Why not? For a postcard they could get their names printed in a paid ad and gratify their ego. They could attain some point and moment of prominence—or at least public attention and notoriety that was gratification to their exhibitionism. They didn't have to send any money—somebody else put up the money to pay for the advertising.

There was nothing in the advertisement to point out that the biggest and strongest and most dangerous enemy of the free world today is communism.

There was nothing to point out that communism is seeking to suppress freedom everywhere it can reach with its claws; that that is the issue in Vietnam.

There was nothing to point out that this Nation has an established foreign policy,

set up by President Truman in the 1940's and reiterated over and over by both him and the Congress of the United States and by President Eisenhower and President Kennedy—that whenever a country being attacked by a Communist aggressor nation seeks our help, we will give it, militarily or otherwise.

There was nothing in the advertisement to bring out that we have reached the days for a final issue in this world; either freedom is to survive and exist where it wishes to, or communism is to control wherever it wishes to.

The ministers who signed the original advertisement are the same type who furthered the Nazi cause by encouragement for the organization and flourishing of Nazi fronts in this country in the 1930's. In some instances they are the same identical men—youngsters with no real intelligence then and apparently having gained little in the years that have passed.

They are the same type that, in the years immediately following World War II, again furthered the Communist cause; and in some instances they are the same men. In all of these activities they were ably assisted from college faculty ranks; more so now than in the past.

Some of them are the same men, who, mingling with college professors, took part in the Fair Play for Cuba Committee which was a Castro Communist propaganda agency in this country and which became the haven of Lee Harvey Oswald, accused assassin of President Kennedy.

Around the country one finds the same college professors—or the same type—that were in the past engaged in furthering pacifist or similar leftist-liberal organizations now seeking to break down American opposition to its only real enemy in the world—communism.

In the lists of members of the clergy, members of college faculties, members of so-called intellectual and educated groups denouncing President Johnson for his South Vietnam course also are found many who lead in defiance of law in a manner to bring bloody violence and horrible murder as a result of civil rights demonstrations. And in their own advocacy of defiance of law, and sometimes defiance on their own, who can question that they encourage—perhaps without any intent at all—the widespread violence and lawbreaking and even terror that spreads over the Nation today from teenage groups on the beaches through college campuses and into the streets of the cities? Those who proclaim "In the name of God get us out of Vietnam"—through surrender or the equivalent if need be—would do better to say:

"So long as we have a President who will fight against communism and not back down, in Vietnam or anywhere else, in the name of God support him."

#### SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S ACTION IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

(Mr. FUQUA (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support of the President of the United States for his swift and forceful action in the Dominican Republic crisis. Only this bold move prevented yet another nation from falling into the grasp of communism, with the consequence that the United States would have been faced with another Cuba.

The fast-moving events of the past few days saw a revolt begin in that strife-

torn nation which had as its avowed purpose a democratic government. This revolt was quickly taken over by Communist conspirators and drastic action was necessary to prevent another Castro-type government in this hemisphere.

Many of these Communist conspirators, who took control of the revolt, had been trained in these very methods in Cuba. It is the type of situation which concerns us greatly, and one which I spoke to the House about nearly 2 years ago, when I pointed to the growing menace of Communists trained in Cuba who seek to infest every land in South America.

As President Johnson expressed so ably to the Nation, we cannot and will not allow another Castro-type government to further infest this hemisphere. Every beachhead they establish means that they will redouble their efforts to establish others, spreading violence and discord in their wake—destroying every vestige of freedom when they are in control.

I support the swift and dramatic action of the President in sending American forces to protect American lives, and then when it became obvious that a Communist takeover was possible, taking forceful action to prevent such eventualities.

This action on the part of the President is part of the new policy of these United States as we seek to halt aggression and the spread of communism through violence, subversion, and deceit. The Communist aggressors understand only force and this Nation must not waver in its determination to halt the spread of this dictatorial plague which seeks to engulf all mankind. This course of action we have embarked upon is a dangerous one, we know, but one which all those who love freedom must be willing to assume.

I support the President in this firm action.

We seek not to dominate our neighbors, but by the same token, we cannot and must not allow them to fall victims to trained conspirators who seek to place another land under the Communist doctrine, which stifles freedom in all its forms.

I feel that such determined and forceful action on the part of these United States make it crystal clear our determination to preserve freedom, and is the only course of action open to us if we are to ultimately preserve our own democracy.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON THE VOTING AGE

(Mr. ROSENTHAL (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a joint resolution which proposes a constitutional amendment granting American citizens who have attained the age 18 the right to vote.

For many years now, such action has been proposed, discussed, put aside, pro-

posed again, discussed again, and put aside again. I think we ought to understand fully the present factors which make it proper and necessary for citizens of 18 to be entitled to vote.

In the past several years, this country has witnessed a significant growth in the maturity of our younger citizens. Many of these young Americans are actively involved furthering the goals of the Great Society: in civil rights, in the war on poverty, in the Peace Corps, and in the armed services. In the Peace Corps and the VISTA program of the war on poverty, such young citizens are largely responsible for unprecedented successes.

Young men under 21 are spread all over the world as members of our Armed Forces, ready to give their lives to further what we believe to be the rights of all freemen, regardless of nationality. At this very moment, many such young men are dying in southeast Asia.

During this past campaign, an unprecedented number of young citizens offered, without reward, their time and energy to political campaigns all over the country. All of us in this Chamber, I think, realize the extent and, indeed, the importance of this commitment.

Almost every day, I receive intelligent, informed, and well-reasoned letters from young constituents of mine, expressing a wide range of political views. I am constantly impressed by the authority and sophistication of such letters. I also encounter this intelligence and interest when I return to my district to meet with and talk to my constituents in person.

The conclusion seems to me inescapable. Young men and women are already taking part in the American political process, offering their resources and, in many cases, their lives for democratic ideals we all seek to promote. That they should be doing this without the most basic of all political rights—the right to vote—seems to me a serious inconsistency. We are asking our young soldiers to die for our democracy; yet we deny them an electoral voice in the operation of that democracy. We are reaping the benefit of the efforts of young Americans in the war against poverty and the Peace Corps; yet we refuse them basic participation in the system they seek to support and improve. Many of us, regardless of party, find such young people of enormous help in our campaigns, or in summer jobs in our offices. Yet all these young Americans, and all their contemporaries are denied the right to vote.

I strongly urge the adoption of a constitutional amendment to grant that right to citizens above the age of 18.

#### THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL LAW IN THE CONDUCT OF OUR INTERNATIONAL BEHAVIOR

(Mr. DOWNING (at the request of Mr. HOWARD) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, over the years many of us have been con-



May 3, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8945

however, has been pierced in H.R. 6675. The following tables show what would happen to the combined tax rate and maximum contributions, under present law and under H.R. 6675.

*Combined employer-employee contribution*  
[Percent]

Year	Present law	H.R. 6675	(1)
1965	7.25	7.25	
1966	8.25	8.70	0.70
1967	8.25	9.00	1.00
1968	9.25	9.00	1.00
1969-70	9.25	9.80	1.00
1971-72	9.25	9.80	1.00
1973-75	9.25	10.70	1.10
1976-79	9.25	10.80	1.20
1980-86	9.25	11.00	1.40
1987 and after	9.25	11.20	1.60

<sup>1</sup> Portion of H.R. 6675 tax required for basic health insurance program.

*Combined maximum contributions*

Year	Present law	H.R. 6675 without medicare	H.R. 6675 with medicare
1965	\$348.00	\$348.00	\$348.00
1966	396.00	448.00	487.20
1967	396.00	448.00	504.00
1968	444.00	448.00	504.00
1969-70	444.00	492.80	548.80
1971-72	444.00	580.80	646.80
1973-75	444.00	633.60	706.20
1976-79	444.00	633.60	712.80
1980-86	444.00	633.60	726.00
1987 on	444.00	633.60	739.20

Even these contributions do not assure the actuarial soundness of social security. In its last annual report, the board of trustees figured things out on the basis of high, low and intermediate cost estimates, and on both a 75-year and perpetuity basis.

On a high-cost and perpetuity basis, benefits will come to 10.83 percent of payroll, and contributions will total 9.11 percent, producing an actuarial imbalance of 1.72 percent. On the intermediate cost estimate, however, contributions will total 9.11 percent and benefits 9.35 percent, leaving an imbalance of .24 percent, just within the limit of 0.25 percent which Congress has considered acceptable. Figured on a 75-year rather than a perpetuity basis and on intermediate costs, contributions will total 9.10 percent and benefits 9.09 percent, leaving the miniscule positive balance of .01 percent. With low costs and a 75-year basis, it is possible to show a positive balance of 1.13 percent. The figures, in short, can be juggled to show whatever one wants.

The Ways and Means Committee has chosen the figures which show a positive balance of .01 percent. It says H.R. 6675 would shift this "to a lack balance of 0.03 percent, which is below the established limit within which the system is considered substantially in actuarial balance."

However, if the past is any key to the future, contributions will have to rise and be liberalizing of benefits will follow, in a dizzy spiral. As employers' social security payroll taxes go up, their operating costs will rise. With increasing amounts deducted for social security, employees are likely to ask for wage increases to maintain their take-home pay. Faced with these twin developments, employers probably will raise prices. With higher prices, however, social security checks won't go so far, and beneficiaries again presumably will pressure Congress to boost monthly benefits.

In H.R. 6675 Congress seems to feel that it can slow down this process by giving up financing solely through social security taxes. For persons over 65 who are not eligible for medicare benefits from the general funds of the Treasury. The latter also would be used to match \$3 monthly benefits, it would

finance voluntary contributions from persons over 65 who want insurance to cover doctor bills.

Some observers feel that the introduction of general government contributions is the first crack in the dike of financial controls maintained by payroll taxes. They expect some future Congress to decide that if workers and employers object to more than a 10 percent levy, the government could keep on liberalizing social security and make up the difference from the Treasury's general funds.

SSA officials maintain, however, that there is a limit to how much the social security system can obtain from the latter source without necessitating an increase in the income tax.

The Ways and Means Committee has made much of the fact that H.R. 6675 sets up a separate fund for medicare benefits. Rep. GERALD R. FORD, Republican of Michigan, contended during the floor debate on H.R. 6675, however, that the trust funds will not be inviolate. "I need only point out to you that in this bill now before us is a provision increasing the allocation of funds to the disability trust fund to the detriment of the OASI fund," he declared.

Congress is as aware as anyone that there is no such thing as a free lunch—or free retirement or medical benefits. It is, however, much more concerned with the voters of today than with the youngsters who will pay their bills in the future.

This is an appropriate time, then, to recall what the Ways and Means Committee said 10 years ago: "We should take sober warning that, in our zeal to provide ever greater benefits and to provide against an ever wider area of need, we do not destroy the very system which we have created."

#### POPULATION CRISIS COMMITTEE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, former Senator Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, has undertaken a new and challenging job—he is the national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee.

This committee will seek to work with the Federal Government and other organizations in mobilizing public understanding of the population problem, what it is, how it affects us all, and how it should be dealt with in conformity with the convictions and consciences of men of good will throughout the world.

There is tremendous need for more knowledge and research in this area as well as a thorough and straightforward discussion of its implications. As Pope Paul VI declared:

It is an extremely grave problem. It touches on the mainsprings of human life. . . . The question is being subjected to study, as wide and profound as possible, as grave and honest as it must be on a subject of such importance.

Few men are more widely known and respected than former Senator Keating. His interest and activities should stimulate new attention in this problem, which is of increasing concern to us here in the United States as well as in the developing nations of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include following my remarks in the RECORD—the press accounts from the New York Herald-Tribune, the New York Times, and editorials from the New York Post and World-Telegram.

There being no objection, the newspaper articles and editorials were

ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1965]

**KEATING TO HEAD BIRTH-CONTROL DRIVE—FORMER SENATOR WILL DIRECT LOBBY IN WASHINGTON FOR A NEW ACTION GROUP**

(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, April 20.—Former Senator Kenneth B. Keating announced today that he would head a new national campaign for deeper governmental involvement in promoting birth control.

Mr. Keating said he would be national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee, a group that will differ from other birth-control organizations by engaging in direct lobbying in Washington.

The former Republican Senator from New York will be paid for his work in the part-time job. He would not say how much. The committee will not enjoy tax-free status because it will be attempting to influence Congress and executive agencies in their policies.

"The current explosive growth of population threatens the success of the Alliance for Progress, the war on poverty, foreign aid, and innumerable domestic programs to which Congress has committed billions of dollars," Mr. Keating said at a news conference in his Washington law office.

"I have accepted the leadership of this committee with the belief that it is one of the most useful services that I can render my fellow citizens," he declared.

#### STILL INTERESTED IN POLITICS

Mr. Keating, who was defeated in his bid for a second term by Robert F. Kennedy last fall, joined the Washington and New York law firm of Royall Koegel & Rogers 2 weeks ago. He is also serving as Washington counsel for his old Rochester firm of Harris, Beach, Wilcox, Dale & Linowitz.

The former Senator said that his assumption of the committee chairmanship did not necessarily signal an end to his career in politics or government.

"I have no plans to run for public office again," the 64-year-old lawyer said, "but that doesn't mean I've eliminated that as a possibility. I don't know anything about any Presidential appointment; no one in public office has ever spoken to me about such a thing."

One goal of the new committee, its chairman indicated, will be an increase in Federal expenditure for birth-control research.

Among his associates on the committee, Mr. Keating listed High Moore, chairman of the board of the Dixie Cup Co.; Cass Canfield, chairman of the executive committee of Harper & Row; and William H. Draper, Jr., a former Army general now chairman of the board of Combustion Engineering, Inc.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Herald Tribune, Apr. 21, 1965]

#### KEATING HEADS GROUP ON POPULATION CONTROL

(By Fred Farris)

WASHINGTON.—Former Senator Kenneth B. Keating announced yesterday he will head a private committee formed "to mobilize support" for population control.

"The world population explosion," the New York Republican said, "is fast becoming the most critical problem of our time. It will have a profound effect upon the welfare of mankind in the decades ahead, and will be a determining influence for war or peace."

The white-haired ex-legislator, defeated for reelection last November by ROBERT KENNEDY, also told a news conference he had no plans now "to run for public office, but I do not discount that in the future."

#### NO OFFER

He said he had not been consulted or approached by anyone "directly or indirectly"

8946

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 3, 1965

about a Presidential appointment. Mr. Keating had expressed an interest in an ambassadorial assignment, but so far none has been offered.

Therefore, in addition to his work with a Washington-New York law firm Mr. Keating accepted the post of national chairman of the Population Crisis Committee. The committee, which will not be tax exempt, is supported by contributions from "philanthropists and other interested in this movement," he said.

Mr. Keating would not disclose the salary he will receive, saying this was a matter between him and the members of the committee. A staff aid, however, told a reporter the amount would be nominal and that Mr. Keating's law practice would be his primary source of income.

Pointing to graphs to illustrate the problem at a press conference in his Washington law office, Mr. Keating said the U.S. population would grow by 150 million people in "35 short years at the present rate of increase." This raised the unhappy prospect, he said, of "8 million unemployed, of 10 million on welfare, of 30 million elderly, and 100 million children to be taken care of."

## ABROAD

Abroad, the problem is even more "staggering to contemplate," he said. "There will be 1 billion—1,000 million more people in the next 15 years—a number greater than all the people now living in the 55 countries of Europe and the entire Western Hemisphere taken together."

President Johnson said in his state of the Union message in January he would "seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population." But, Mr. Keating said, the United States now is spending less than \$10 million on birth-control research "out of an annual budget of \$15 billion for research. \* \* \* Less than 1 percent of the cost of putting a man on the moon by 1970."

The Alliance for Progress, the antipoverty campaign, foreign aid, and "innumerable domestic programs" costing billions are imperiled by runaway population growth, he said.

Therefore, he said, he undertook "the leadership of this committee with the belief that it is one of the most useful services that I can render my fellow citizens."

The main objective of the committee, which will be headquartered at 1780 K Street, NW, Washington, is "to work with and assist people interested in the population problem both in the executive branch and legislative branch of Government," Mr. Keating said.

"We must first find out what is now being done under existing legislation in this field," he said. "When we have all that, we will decide what to do next."

His committee will "be engaged in efforts to stimulate legislation," and therefore could not be tax exempt. Contributions will not be tax deductible.

Among committee backers and officers are: Hugh Moore, chairman of the board of the Dixie Cup Corp., and founder of the Moore Fund, who will serve as treasurer; Cass Canfield, chairman of the executive committee of Harper & Row Publishing Co.; Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., investment banker and chairman of the board of Combustion Engineering, Inc. Mr. Moore asked Mr. Keating to head the committee.

## FAR TOO EARLY

Mr. Keating, who spoke at a Republican fund-raising dinner in Lansing, Mich., Monday night, said he was not backing any one for the GOP Presidential nomination at present. "It's far too early," he said, adding, "I have a very high regard for George Romney."

"One reporter, with the effect on Catholic voters of the sensitive birth-control issue

apparently in mind, asked Mr. Keating whether realistically he could return to New York politics after serving as head of the Population Crisis Committee.

He said he had "no plans to climb mountains" during his out-of-public-office period—an allusion to Senator ROBERT KENNEDY's recent climb of Mount Kennedy, in Canada. But he added: "I did offer to demonstrate my athletic prowess in Lansing by swimming out into Lake Michigan."

[From the New York (N.Y.) Post, Apr. 22, 1965]

## MR. KEATING'S NEW MISSION

Kenneth B. Keating deserves to be in government. But if the administration is unprepared to offer him a post, there are few nongovernmental public positions of greater importance that the assignment he has now undertaken.

As head of the newly formed Population Crisis Committee, Mr. Keating will lead a national drive to persuade the Government to take a more active role in promoting family planning and curbing overpopulation.

The moment is auspicious for such a campaign. Liberalization of the Catholic attitude on birth control makes it practical politics for the first time to think of large public programs and appropriations.

Mr. Keating is a persuasive advocate. His long experience in public affairs will make him an effective lobbyist for the important cause he has agreed to represent.

[From the World Telegram, Apr. 24, 1965]

## KEATING'S NEW ROLE

In the same spirit of conscientious service that characterized his years in Congress, former Senator Kenneth B. Keating has agreed to head a private committee formed to mobilize support for population control.

Expressing his concern over what is "fast becoming the most critical problem of our time," Keating stated the problem succinctly:

"The current explosive growth of population threatens the success of the Alliance for Progress, the war on poverty, foreign aid, and innumerable domestic programs to which Congress has committed billions of dollars."

Man's best efforts toward peace and decent living standards, in other words, are foredoomed if demand outraces supply and human misery burgeons beyond hope of containment and relief.

The projections of population growth during the rest of this century alone are nightmarish in their implications. Increasingly, even among the staunchest foes of birth control, the question is no longer so much whether—but how—corrective measures should be taken.

One goal of the Population Crisis Committee, Keating said, will be an increase in Federal expenditures for birth control research.

Research is, of course, the key. It is the means of developing solutions that will be both efficacious and generally acceptable—and developing those solutions in time.

No question about it, mankind is running a desperate race with famine and misery. And time is alarmingly short.

## "ESCALATION" AS A STRATEGY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in Fortune magazine for April appears a very interesting and timely article by the noted writer and scientist, Mr. Herman Kahn, entitled "Escalation" as a Strategy. I think it is particularly timely because there has been so much talk in recent weeks about escalation in connection with the war in South Vietnam.

Some seem to think escalation is a simple matter; that merely because there may be a few more bombs dropped in Vietnam, this is escalation, and particularly an escalation of horrifying prospects. If these people think that dropping a few bombs on Vietnam is horrifying to behold, let them read the article by Dr. Kahn, who really goes into the subject of escalation in great depth.

I am afraid that those people, in and out of Congress, have not given this subject any of this in-depth study.

I may not agree with everything in Dr. Kahn's analysis of "escalation" but I think it worth reading, so that people who are talking about escalation will have a little better knowledge of what they are talking about and will realize that escalation can take many, many forms; that there are many rungs in the ladder of escalation.

I think Dr. Kahn has listed here about 44 different steps or rungs in the ladder of escalation.

To hear some people speak, one would think there are only one or two rungs in the escalation ladder. A reading of the article will be beneficial; and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## "ESCALATION" AS A STRATEGY

(By Herman Kahn)

(NOTE.—Herman Kahn is the author of "On Thermonuclear War," a book that urged the United States to take civil-defense measures to insure civilization's survival in the event of nuclear war. A mathematician, physicist, and former member of the Rand Corp., Mr. Kahn is now director of the Hudson Institute, a research organization that analyzes international affairs for the Pentagon and other clients. This article has been excerpted from Mr. Kahn's forthcoming book, "On Escalation: Metaphors and Scenarios" to be published by Frederick A. Praeger in May.)

Escalation is a relatively new word in the English language. Though it is becoming more common in newspaper headlines, especially in connection with Vietnam, the dictionaries have yet to define it in a military sense. To many people, escalation connotes an automatic rise in the scale of warfare from the level of an incident to the level of catastrophic nuclear exchange. But to more and more students of military strategy and tactics, it has also come to describe the kind of calculated risk taking that is an established factor of limited conflict in the nuclear age.

Strategies that emphasize the possibility of escalation are associated with the term "brinkmanship." Under modern circumstances no nation wishes to play at brinkmanship recklessly. But to the extent that any nuclear nation is serious in any incipient conflict—or to the extent that it pretends to be serious—it will have to face the consequences of being on the escalation ladder. However, a strategy of escalation, carefully carried out, can actually reduce the dangers of insensate, spasmodic nuclear destruction.

Events in Vietnam provide a case in point. Our opponent in Vietnam can function with great success in one dimension of warfare: guerrilla combat and subversion. The United States, in turn, has an immense superiority in air and naval power and, beyond that, in nuclear power. Behind the North Vietnamese are the Russians, with their nuclear forces, and the Chinese, with



their major but ponderous land armies. But how close the ties may be, and how willing North Vietnam and its allies might be to involve themselves against the United States, remains uncertain. In this complex situation, the United States has been attempting to use its areas of advantage to counter the special strengths of the opponents, to "escalate" the war in a calculated way, all the time trying to make it clear that it intends to abide by certain limitations—unless further provoked. In Vietnam the United States is clearly a nation practicing the new dimensions of escalation, reflecting its new understanding of the reasoned and restrained, yet determined, use of limited force in a world of political challenge and nuclear danger.

To make this study concrete, I have devised a ladder—a metaphorical ladder—that provides a convenient list of some of the more important options facing the strategist. This ladder indicates that there are many continuous paths between a low-level crisis and an all-out war, none of which are necessarily or inexorably to be followed. My ladder provides a useful framework for the systematic study of a crisis. There is no attempt here to recommend any courses of action. What is attempted is to describe the way stations of ascending conflict so that the elements can be recognized, and the distance from all-out war estimated. There are, of course, those who think a study of escalation is dangerous and perhaps immoral; I believe that it is dangerous and perhaps immoral not to understand how nations might act under the pressures of successive crises. Hence this study of the rungs and thresholds is the best contribution I know how to make to the avoidance of recklessness or panic.

**Rung 1. Ostensible crisis:** In the ostensible crisis stage, one side asserts, more or less openly and explicitly, that unless a given dispute is resolved in the immediate future it will in effect begin to climb the rungs of the escalation ladder. These threats are made credible by various hints as to how important the government considers the issues. There may be officially inspired newspaper stories to the effect that the chief of state takes a serious view of the matter. There may be explicit announcements or speeches by other important officials—but none of them of the bridge-burning variety, none deliberately designed to make it really difficult for these same officials to back down later.

**Rung 2. Political, economic, and diplomatic gestures:** Legal but unfair, unfriendly, inequitable, or threatening acts are carried out against the opponent to punish or put pressure on him.

**Rung 3. Solemn and formal declarations:** Such declarations go further than rung 2 in demonstrating resolve and commitment, but they need not be deliberately hostile. There could be merely a solemn executive declaration to other states of a nation's policy in a certain area, perhaps deliberately avoiding a precise statement of the policy's applicability and limitations. An example of this ambiguity is the joint congressional resolution of August 1964, passed at the President's request after the escalation in the Gulf of Tonkin. Congress resolved that "the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

Such a proclamation is usually a warning to a potential opponent not to climb further up the escalation ladder, at least in the area covered by the announcement. The declaration may be thought of as preemptive or preventive escalation, which tries to forestall further escalation by the opponent. It also marks the limit to which either side can go without dangerously rocking the boat.

**Rung 4. Hardening of positions:** As soon as negotiations take on much more of a coercive than a contractual character, I would argue that we have passed the don't-rock-the-boat stage and reached rung 4. Certainly this is true if either or both of the antagonists attempt to increase the credibility of their resolve and commitment by irrevocable acts. Such an act might be an announcement by the Soviet Union that it has signed a peace treaty with East Germany and no longer has any direct control over the access routes to Berlin.

In such confrontations both sides are likely to call attention to the totally destructive character of thermonuclear war, and state that there is thus no alternative to peace, it clearly being implied that, unless the madmen on the other side come to their senses, all will be lost. Alternatively, one can reassure one's own side by pointing out that the other side is not mad, and will therefore back down.

**Rung 5. Show of force:** As the crisis intensifies, one side or the other could draw attention to the fact that it does have the capability to use force if necessary. There are various ways of showing such force, direct or indirect, silent or noisy. In a direct show of force one or the other nation might move naval or air units, mobilize reserves, conduct provocative military exercises or maneuvers, particularly in sensitive areas, or even order "routine" deployment of naval and military units in such areas—all with widespread publicity. In an indirect show of force one could test missiles in a provocative way, conduct normal maneuvers but with possibly abnormal publicity, publicize the use of military equipment in "normal" but special maneuvers that simulate an element in the current crisis—e.g., the use of tanks to break roadblocks.

**Rung 6. Significant mobilization:** A show of force can be accompanied by a modest mobilization that not only increases one's strength but also indicates a readiness to call on more force or to accelerate the arms race. An example of this was President Kennedy's call up of reserves in the Berlin crisis of 1962. As always, private communication, either direct or indirect, through principals or intermediaries, or through the use of more or less deliberately arranged leaks, can all play an important role.

**Rung 7. "Legal" harassment:** One can harass the opponent's prestige, property, or people legally. That is to say, one may act in a very hostile and provocative manner, but within the limits of international law.

**Rung 8. Harassing acts of violence:** If the crisis is still not resolved, one side or the other may move on to illegal acts, such as acts of violence, or harassments intended to confuse, exhaust, frighten, and otherwise harm, weaken, or demoralize the opponent or his allies. Bombs may be exploded by unauthorized or anonymous means. Enemy nationals within one's borders can be badly mistreated or killed. An "aroused" citizenry may stone or raid the other nation's embassy. Frontier guards may be shot. There may be the limited covert use of guerrilla warfare, piracy, sabotage, or terrorism. Both sides could step up reconnaissance probing operations or other intelligence activities. One side or the other may launch overflights or other invasions of sovereignty.

If the acts are carried out clandestinely or covertly, under the guise of being individually motivated, the escalation is relatively low. If the size, scale, and degree of organization of these acts are increased, and their official character made plain, the escalation is increased, until finally we reach a level at which uniformed personnel, obviously under orders of their government, are carrying through the actions.

**Rung 9. Dramatic military confrontations:** The existing permanent alert of U.S. and Soviet strategic bomber and missile forces is an almost continual global confrontation.

Under the circumstances of prolonged cold war this may be regarded as preescalation. However, the situation changes if there is a dramatic local confrontation of land and sea forces (as, for example, at the Brandenburg Gate). Such confrontations are direct tests of nerve, resolve, and recklessness. They are also dramatic enough to make everyone take note of what has happened. Because it seems obvious that these confrontations can blow up, and because in the past such incidents have often caused wars, many people think of them as being closer to the brink of all-out war than in fact they usually are. But despite contemporary conditions of a relatively firm balance of terror, they do indeed indicate that large acts of violence are possible, and that the unthinkable all-out war is becoming thinkable.

Thus we cross the "nuclear-war-is-unthinkable" threshold. It was to this threshold that we came during the Cuban missile crisis of October 1962, at the climax of a case of abrupt escalation. President Kennedy's dramatic television address to the Nation on October 22 explicitly told the Soviet Union where it had been unbearably provocative. Both the U.S.S.R. and the U.S., he said, had recognized the need for tacit rules in the postwar world and accordingly had "deployed strategic nuclear weapons with great care, never upsetting the precarious status quo which insured that these weapons would not be used in the absence of some vital challenges." He indicated that while the Americans had always been careful, the Russians had now broken the rules in "this secret, swift, extraordinary buildup of Communist missiles in an area well known to have a special and historical relation to the United States . . . this sudden clandestine decision to station strategic weapons for the first time outside of Soviet soil—is a deliberately provocative and unjustified change in the status quo, which cannot be accepted by this country if our courage and our commitments are ever to be trusted again by either friend or foe."

He went on to describe the detailed measures that the U.S. was taking (mobilization, blockade, air alerts) and issued the famous warning: "It shall be the policy of this Nation to regard any nuclear missile launched from Cuba against any nation in the Western Hemisphere as an attack by the Soviet Union on the United States, requiring a full retaliatory response upon the Soviet Union." (Of course, anyone familiar with current U.S. policy would note that the phrase "full retaliatory response" does not specify the form of the attack.)

Then, and possibly most important of all, Mr. Kennedy issued the following warning: "Any hostile move anywhere in the world against the safety and freedom of peoples to whom we are committed, including in particular the brave people of West Berlin, will be met by whatever action is needed." Some students of the subject have questioned whether the President was wise to call the Russians' attention to the option of Berlin. In fact, it is quite important to show that one is willing to face the possibility of such counterescalations.

**Rung 10. Provocative diplomatic break:** This act would be intended to communicate to the opponent that one's reliance on the traditional peaceful measures of persuasion or coercion is at an end and that acts of force may now be resorted to.

**Rung 11. Superready status:** Strategic forces may be dispersed, leaves canceled, preventive, and routine maintenance halted, training deferred, every possible piece of equipment and unit put in a ready status and limited war forces deployed. Because of the relative invulnerability and alertness under normal peacetime conditions of the U.S. Minuteman and Polaris forces (and to some extent of the SAC bombers on alert), such actions may make a greater difference

and thus mean more when practiced by the Soviet Union than by the United States.

Rung 12. Large conventional war: The stage has now been set for some kind of organized military violence. It may be undeclared war or border fighting such as occurred between the Japanese and the Russians in 1939 (involving thousands of soldiers), a Trieste-type occupation of disputed territory, or a major police action as in Korea. If such a war is fought with any intensity, both sides suffer casualties in large numbers but neither will use its most efficient or quality weapons—the nuclear, bacteriological, or chemical weapons. Paradoxically, the more useful these weapons are in the narrow military sense, the less likely they are to be used. In any case, there will be many casualties at this rung, and, at least in the initial stages of the action, an obvious deepening of the crisis.

Rung 13. Large compound escalation: One way to achieve a high overall level of escalation and still keep each separate act as an act relatively low on the ladder is to retaliate or escalate in a completely different theater from that in which the primary conflict is being waged. This may be especially escalatory if the second theater is sensitive or potentially vital—such a situation might have arisen, for example, if the Soviet Union had moved against Berlin during the Cuba crisis.

It is interesting to note that, except for rather small-scale exceptions, this obvious technique has not been used since World War II, even though there has been much concern about the possibility. Nearly everyone has instinctively recognized the danger of compound escalation. The sheer audacity of starting a new crisis when another is at full force is very provocative, yet in the paradoxical world of escalation this might be the very reason it would be judged in certain circumstances to be an effective measure.

Rung 14. Declaration of limited conventional war: This would be an attempt to achieve one or both of the following objectives: (1) It would be a clear-cut, unilateral announcement of "no nuclear first use." (2) It would try to limit the conventional war geographically or otherwise in a manner considered most favorable or stable by the side making the declaration. Such a declaration would have grave symbolic, political, and moral effects upon one's own country and the opponent.

Rung 15. Barely nuclear war: It may occur during a conventional warlike act (rung 12) or the superready status (rung 11) that a nuclear weapon is used unintentionally (accidentally or without authorization). Or one of the antagonists may make military or political use of a nuclear weapon and try to give the impression that its use was unintentional.

Rung 16. Nuclear ultimatums: One side or the other seriously considers the possibility of a central war and communicates this fact convincingly to its opponent. People begin leaving cities; in fact, one might define an intense crisis as that point when 10 percent of the population of New York City or Moscow has left out of fear of an attack.

Rung 17. Limited evacuation (about 20 percent): This would most likely be at least a quasi-official move ordered by a government either for bargaining or prudential reasons, or both. The difficulties, and possible public and political reactions, make such an evacuation a momentous decision.

Rung 18. Spectacular show of force: A spectacular show or demonstration of force would involve using major weapons in a way that does no obvious damage, but appears determined, menacing, or reckless. An example would be the explosion of a weapon at a high altitude over enemy territory. This would intensify the fear of war in the hope of frightening the enemy into backing down.

Rung 19. Justifiable counterforce attack: A justifiable attack would be sufficiently spe-

cialized and limited to seem a reasonable response to provocation, and yet it might significantly, or even decisively, degrade the military capability, prestige, or morale of the opponent. An example would be the destruction of a submarine on the claim that it had carried out threatening maneuvers. Here a high degree of escalation could easily be involved, particularly if the casualty were a strategic-weapon submarine. A nation could invent an excuse for such an act by manufacturing an incident—perhaps by fabricating a limited nuclear attack and blaming the submarine.

Rung 20. Peaceful worldwide embargo or blockade: Worldwide embargo would be an extreme measure of nonviolent coercion brought to bear against an opponent.

Once war has started, no other line of demarcation is at once so clear, so easily defined and understood, as the line between not using and using nuclear weapons. There are, of course, criticisms of this point of view. Some of them take as their point of departure a fact of physics and engineering—that it is possible to have an extremely low-yield nuclear weapon that is no more powerful than a chemical explosive. True, the distinction between very small nuclear weapons and large chemical explosives does tend to narrow under analysis. But any argument designed to refute the nuclear prohibition on purely technical energy-release grounds misses the point: Even though the distinction between nuclear and nonnuclear war may have defects from some technical points of view, the distinction possesses a functional meaning, or utility that transcends any technical question.

We should support and encourage this distinction because, for a variety of reasons that cannot be detailed in this space, it works to the advantage of both the United States and the world as a whole. But it is equally important to understand that once the threshold has been crossed by an enemy, by accident, or by us, we do not stand automatically in the balance of the unthinkable war. The first use of nuclear weapons, even if against military targets, is likely to be less for the purpose of destroying the other side's military forces or to handicap its operations than for redress, bargaining, or deterrence purposes.

Rung 21. Local nuclear war, exemplary: One side can drop a nuclear bomb or two in order to show the other side that unless it backs down or accepts a reasonable compromise, more bombs are likely to follow. As this would be the first unmistakably deliberate use of these weapons since World War II, it would be a profoundly consequential act.

Rung 22. Declaration of limited war: At this point a formal declaration of limited nuclear war might occur. A nation could use that declaration to set relatively exact limits to the types of nuclear action that it intends to initiate, and to indicate the type of retaliation that it is prepared to countenance from the enemy without further escalation. In this way, eruption to all-out war might be made less likely, and the escalation itself made more explicit, which might increase the pressure to compromise. The declaration also could include a formal announcement of the conditions under which the declarer would be prepared to de-escalate.

Rung 23. Local nuclear war: Past NATO planning has envisaged the immediate use of hundreds of nuclear weapons in reply to a conventional attack in Europe by the U.S.S.R. As opposed to the exemplary purposes of rung 21, NATO planned to use nuclear weapons for traditional military purposes—for defense or destruction of the opponent's local capability—and the scale of the action and the targeting were to be dictated by these military considerations. The increasing actual or potential avail-

ability of a varied inventory of small, inexpensive, nuclear weapons (including such esoteric devices as the Davy Crockett missile and the neutron bomb) is likely to renew discussion of the possibility of local military nuclear war. It is, and will likely continue to be, an important objective of U.S. military forces to be able to wage such war, at least in Europe, even if a no-bomb-use policy is explicitly adopted by all nations.

Rung 24. Unusual, provocative, and significant countermeasures: One side might carry out redeployments or maneuvers that have the effect of increasing an opponent's vulnerability to attack or otherwise degrading its capability, morale, or will.

Rung 25. Evacuation of cities (about 70 percent): At this point the situation may be very close to large-scale war. It may now seem advisable to evacuate a large number of people from cities. The total would probably amount to between two-thirds and three-fourths of the population—women and children and those men who are not essential to the functioning of the cities. I would judge that all important industries, communications, transportation facilities, etc., could be operated by about a quarter of the population or less.

Attacks so far have avoided the enemy's zone of interior, and have thus observed a salient threshold. The line between the external world and the nation may even be stronger as a firebreak than the threshold between conventional and nuclear war, since it is an older distinction, invested with far more emotion and prestige. Under current conditions it is reasonably clear that in the next decade the likelihood that a nation (including the United States and the Soviet Union) would invite certain annihilation for the sake of its allies is going to tend to diminish to the vanishing point, however repugnant or dishonorable this development may now seem. But the likelihood of a nation risking the kind of restrained attacks discussed below may or may not diminish so sharply, depending in part on the decision-makers' expectations of the rules being observed.

Rung 26. Demonstration attack on zone of interior: An attack could be made, perhaps on an isolated mountaintop or empty desert, which does dramatic and unmistakable physical damage, if only to the topography.

Rung 27. Attack on military targets: One side might begin destroying portions of the other side's weapon systems, but in a careful way so as not to cause much collateral damage. These attacks could be launched primarily to reduce the defender's military capability significantly by finding leverage targets.

Rung 28. Exemplary attacks against property: The next step would obviously be to increase the level of these limited, nuclear, strategic attacks. One possibility would be attacks on such installations as bridges, dams, or gaseous-diffusion plants. More damaging and dangerous would be limited attacks on cities, presumably after warning had been delivered and the cities evacuated. The purpose would be to destroy property, not people.

Rung 29. Attacks on population: In any crisis of the early sixties this attack would probably be much higher on the ladder than I put it here, but if the balance of terror becomes sufficiently stable, and governments are believed to be under intense and graduated mutual deterrents, even this attack could occur without an eruption to spasm or other central wars.

Rung 30. Complete evacuation (about 95 percent): At this point, large-scale warfare has begun. If at all possible, each side is likely to evacuate its cities almost completely, leaving 5 to 10 percent of the population behind for essential activities.

Rung 31. Reciprocal reprisals: This is a war with more or less continual exchanges.



May 3, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8949

Many strategists believe that reciprocal-reprisal wars might be a standard tactic of the future when the balance of terror is judged—whether correctly or not—to be almost absolute.

Thermonuclear wars are likely to be short—lasting a few hours to a couple of months at most. In such a war it is unlikely that cities would in themselves be targets of any great military consequence. But it is perfectly possible that a nation might attack cities simply without thinking it through. In Defense Secretary McNamara's speech at Ann Arbor on June 16, 1962, the United States has more or less formally enunciated a "no cities except in reprisal" strategy, but the strategy is neither clearly understood nor firmly held even here. Soviet strategists and political leaders, for their part, have declared that Soviet forces would not recognize any such "artificial" distinctions in a nuclear war. This position could be an accurate reflection of current Soviet strategic doctrine, but it is most likely that it is a very unreliable indicator of actual Soviet behavior in a "moment of truth"—or of Soviet beliefs about U.S. conduct at such a time.

Let us assume, for the moment, that a threshold between central military targets and central civilian targets (i.e., cities) can be maintained in an actual war. Thus we can consider the possibility of waging a very large all-out, but very closely controlled, central war, in which there is deliberate attempt to avoid civilians and their property.

**Rung 32. Formal declaration of general war:** The formal declaration of war could indicate that the side issuing the declaration had no immediate intention of attacking, since if it had such an intention, there would be strong reasons to ignore pre-nuclear convention and simply attack. Such a declaration certainly would remove some inhibitions against the use of force and coercion, put pressures on allies and some neutrals to cooperate, and mobilize a nation's facilities for defense and tend to suppress internal opposition. It would force the other side to recognize explicitly that a formal peace treaty will have to be written before the issue is settled; delaying tactics will not settle the matter. But while tending to prevent de-escalation and to threaten future (eventual) escalation, it nonetheless might look temporizing and provide an opening for bargaining.

**Rung 33. Slow-motion counter property war:** In this attack each side destroys the other's property, still attempting to force the other side to back down.

**Rung 34. Slow-motion counterforce war:** This is a campaign in which each side attempts attrition of the other side's weapon systems over a period of time. One can conceive of a slow-motion counterforce war lasting for weeks or months during which, for example, submarines are hunted down.

**Rung 35. Constrained force reduction salvo:** The attacker here attempts to destroy a significant but small portion of the defender's force in a single strike while avoiding undesired collateral damage. It is especially likely to be used against weak links or high-leverage targets at the outbreak of a war.

**Rung 36. Constrained disarming attack:** The attacker tries to destroy a significant portion of the defender's first-strike nuclear forces and even some of his second-strike weapons, such as missiles, in silos. But the attacks would avoid, as much as possible civilian targets. This would make it disadvantageous for the defender to launch a counterstrike since the defender's damaged forces might be able to do only a limited amount of damage even with a counterstrike on cities. The defender is also under pressure to negotiate since it is now probable that the attacker could threaten another attack, this one an all-out strike.

**Rung 37. Counterforce-with-avoidance attack:** This attack differs from a constrained disarming attack by being less scrupulous about avoiding collateral damage to cities and by not deliberately sparing much if any of the enemy's secondstrike weaponry. In the case of a Soviet strike against the United States, such an attack might include hitting Tucson (a city of 265,000 population, which is completely ringed with Titans), but probably would avoid the Norfolk Navy Yard, and the Pentagon. If it did hit these targets, or the SAC bases near very large cities, Russia might use 20-kiloton weapons rather than 20 megatons in order to limit the collateral destruction. After such an attack, one must assume a counterattack, but one may still try to use threats of further escalation to limit the defender's response.

**Rung 38. Unmodified counterforce attack:** Although the targets are still enemy weapon systems, the military plans are formulated and the operation is carried out with general disregard as to whether enemy civilians are killed or nonmilitary property destroyed (though there may be disadvantages accepted to avoid fallout or other dangers to allies or neutrals). No attempt would be made either to lessen or to increase collateral damage to the enemy. This attack might be described as the classical form of all-out total war.

At this point the warring nations are at the threshold of civilian central wars. Under current U.S. controlled response doctrine, not only does the U.S. intend to observe the city threshold, but an enormous incentive is given to the U.S.S.R., in a war against the United States, to do so as well and to avoid attacking U.S. cities in the first wave—whether this wave is the first or second strike of the war. But even if population is not the target for the first wave, it could be the target of the second or later waves. In any case, it would always be threatened. The residual vulnerability of the civilian hostages and cities could then affect, to a great extent, the kind of peace treaty the U.S.S.R. could force on us, or that we could force on the U.S.S.R. For this reason, it makes sense to try to protect people from being threatened by second- and later-wave attacks, even though they may not have been adequately protected on the first wave.

It seems to me that the United States should, at the minimum, undertake a civil-defense program which is compatible with what the controlled-response doctrine foresees in a time of war. Part of such a program would be fallout protection for the entire population, and blast protection for the 5 million to 10 million people who live within about 10 miles of priority strategic targets. Such a program might require \$5 billion to \$10 billion spread over 5 years or so. In a very large range of types of wars these measures could save the lives of 30 million to 50 million people, and in addition make it more likely that a war, if it came, would in fact be a war of controlled response.

**Rung 39. Slow-motion counterforce war:** This takes the ultimate form—city trading. This is, of course, the most bizarre of all the options that are discussed in modern strategic analysis. The possibility of city trading arises because of today's unprecedented situation in which both sides may have almost invulnerable forces while both sides' civilians may be completely and irrevocably vulnerable to these invulnerable forces. There has never before been such a situation in the history of mankind. This kind of war would be the extreme and ultimate form of deliberate, selective and controlled response—but one not necessarily or even likely to be beyond the psychological capabilities of decisionmakers if the only alternatives were total destruction or complete capitulation.

**Rung 40. Countervalue salvo:** It is, of

course, always possible in fighting a slow-motion counterforce, or slow-motion countervalue war, that one side will fire a large number of missiles at civilian targets, either in inadvertent or deliberate eruption.

**Rung 41. Augmented disarming attack:** This would be an attack on military targets deliberately modified to obtain as much collateral countercity damage as a bonus as was feasible.

**Rung 42. Civilian devastation attack:** This attack corresponds to the usual popular picture of nuclear war in which there is a deliberate effort to destroy or greatly damage the enemy's society. It is distinguished from spasm or insensate war only by having some element of calculation and by the fact there may be some withholding or control.

**Rung 43. Some other kind of controlled general war:** It is possible to have many kinds of all-out but controlled as well as all out but uncontrolled wars. In a national, all-out, but controlled war, military action would be accompanied by threats and promises, and military operations themselves would be restricted to those that contributed to attaining victory—an acceptable or desirable peace treaty.

**Rung 44. Spasm or insensate war:** The figurative word "spasm" is chosen because it describes the usual image of central war in which there is only a go-ahead order; all the buttons are pressed. A spasm war, of course, may occur, but to the extent that there is any art of war possible in the thermonuclear age, the attempt must be made to prevent it.

## DOWN THE LADDER

In the same way, the study of de-escalation and its limits and of crisis termination—how to climb down and off the ladder—is vital to the management of crises and escalation. De-escalation is even more sensitive to accurate communication and shared understandings than escalation is. The opponent may have a different conception of escalation and still understand well enough the pressures being applied to him; but, typically, in order to coordinate de-escalation moves by easing pressure, both sides must have a shared understanding of what is happening. They may not have a sufficient shared understanding if one side's paradigm of the world differs in important ways from the other's.

Because of the need for shared understanding in deescalation, unilateral initiatives are often mentioned in connection with deescalation. Unilateral initiatives may be quite helpful. They may relax tension to a point where it is easier to settle a dispute, or to leave it unresolved but less dangerous. Even small concessions can be significant as turning points in the escalation process. Thus, even if a move is more symbolic than meaningful in itself, its deescalatory value may be large. A serious concern, however, may be to maintain the appearance of resolve while making conciliatory moves. For this reason, the side which is doing better may find that it should take the burden of the initial deescalatory step.

Typical deescalation gestures take many forms. They may include the reversal of a previous escalation move, the settling of an extraneous dispute, the freeing of prisoners, conciliatory statements, the replacement of a "hard" key official by a "softer" or more flexible individual, or simply waiting for time to have its cooling effect. Concessions need not be made explicitly. Nor need the matter under dispute be settled, so long as tension is decreased to the point where the dispute is no longer as high on the escalation ladder as it once was.

Escalation is a competition in resolve, and resolve is often measured by a willingness to pay costs in pursuit of certain objectives. One side or the other may decide to deescalate simply because it feels it has suf-

ferred enough. It is sometimes difficult for dedicated and resolute military leaders to accept this notion. The World War I theory of the "last fifteen minutes" (in which it was asserted that that side which could hold out fifteen minutes longer would win) is still very widespread. But this theory of conflict is often completely inappropriate for a high-level escalation, and may not be the most relevant aspect of a low-level conflict. In low-level conflicts both sides typically have virtually unlimited resources that could be deployed into the local conflict. Both sides thus can, and usually will, insist on a compromise solution.

Escalation also is referred to as a competition in risk taking. One side or the other may decide that it no longer is willing to endure these risks. In the nuclear age this is likely to be the greatest factor in deescalation.

Most people will accept without argument that there will always be conflict. But conflicts need not inevitably lead to the kinds of crises and escalations that lie on the rungs of the ladder I have discussed. Any crisis that reaches the upper rungs of the escalation ladder is likely to be regarded by both participants as a potential—and mutual—disaster. As both sides learn that the gains of these conflicts are small compared to the dangers and other costs, they are likely to be cautious about either starting or intensifying such conflicts. Arms control has its place in this scheme of things: it should be a major objective of arms control to prevent the kinds of crises in which the options on the escalation ladder become important, and to lessen the damage and risk if these crises arise. But our first and most important need is to escape the inertia that tends to hold us captive to obsolete notions and the desire for simplistic solutions, which can only lead to disastrous capitulation or eruption—to paraphrase President Kennedy, we need wider choices than holocaust or surrender.

#### ANSWER TO NEW YORK TIMES CRITICISM OF ADMINISTRATION ON VIETNAM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last Friday—April 30, 1965—the New York Times in its main editorial criticized the administration's policy on Vietnam and raised a series of questions which indicated that the administration has released contradictory information on the war there.

So my remarks are not misunderstood, let me state clearly at the outset that my purpose in rising is not to decry criticism of the administration by the Times or any other newspaper or any citizen, public or private.

The New York Times, in the judgment of many Americans, is the best newspaper in the country. Many would say that the New York Times is probably the greatest newspaper in the world. Nothing in my remarks should be construed as critical of this superlative institution or of the integrity and ability of its remarkable editorial staff.

I certainly would affirm the right of any citizen to voice criticism of the administration and the duty of any newspaper to do so when it felt such criticism appropriate. I have exercised that right many times in the past myself.

The Times' editorial states that "distortion is inevitable when information is manipulated to serve the policy for the day."

It continues:

For months, during the campaign against Senator Goldwater, the administration line was that the war in South Vietnam was substantially self-sustaining and had to be won there. Almost overnight, when the bombing of North Vietnam began, information was produced to prove that "aggression from the North," as the State Department's white paper called it, is the key to everything. No wonder many Americans were puzzled.

This would indeed have been puzzling if it were true. But the fact is, it was not true. And the New York Times' own files contain dozens of stories to discount it. Both President Kennedy and President Johnson pointed out on numerous occasions the very real danger we faced in Vietnam. The State Department issued a two volume report in December 1961, which set forth in great detail the participation of North Vietnam in the war raging in the South.

The very title of the report—"A Threat to the Peace: North Vietnam's Effort To Conquer South Vietnam"—speaks clearly in defense of the administration. Let me just read the table of contents of the report merely to point out that the State Department was well aware of North Vietnam's participation with the Vietcong. It was 1961 when the State Department wrote this:

	Page
Introduction.....	1
I. The Background.....	3
II. The Setting (South Vietnam).....	5
III. The Pattern of Vietcong Activity in the South.....	7
A. The Military Pattern.....	7
B. The Political Pattern.....	10
C. The Use of Terror.....	12
IV. Direction of the Vietcong by North Vietnam.....	14
V. The Vietcong organization in North and South Vietnam.....	18
A. Political Organization.....	18
B. Military Organization.....	19
C. Intelligence Organization.....	20
VI. Evidence of External Guidance and Support of the Vietcong.....	23
A. Background.....	23
B. Infiltration of Agents.....	24
1. The An Don Case.....	25
2. The Do Dinh Hai Case.....	26
C. Infiltration of Military Personnel.....	27
1. The Calu Case.....	28
2. The Tra Bong Case.....	28
3. The Dakrotah Case.....	29
4. The Le Hoa Case.....	29
5. The Diary of Nguyen Dinh Kieu.....	30
D. Introduction of Supplies from the North.....	32
1. The Calu Case (No. 2).....	32
2. The Ly Son Case.....	33
3. Northern Maps of the South.....	36
4. Medical Equipment from North Vietnam and the Communist Bloc.....	37
E. Laos as a Base and a Route for the Vietcong.....	38
1. North Vietnamese Forces in Laos.....	39
2. The Movement of North Vietnamese Troops from Laos Into South Vietnam.....	40
F. The Goal of the "Liberation" Movement: Communist Control Over All Vietnam.....	43

Introduction—Continued..... Page

VI. Evidence of External Guidance, Etc.—Continued

F. The Goal of the "Liberation" Movement, Etc.—Con.

1. Communist Party Cadres in the South.....	43
2. Party Leadership of Front Organizations.....	44
3. Calls for More Aggressive Action.....	46
4. The Policy of Forcible Seizure of Power.....	46
5. Party Policy Toward the Front.....	47
6. Deceptive Appeal for Broad Support of the "Liberation" Movement Is a Temporary Policy of the Communist Party.....	48
7. Policy of Violence by the Vietcong.....	48
VII. The Present Danger.....	49
VIII. Conclusions.....	51
A. The Meaning of a Vietcong Victory.....	51
B. The Need for Action.....	52

The Times then raised three questions which presumably further document its charge that the administration has been distorting and manipulating the information on Vietnam to suit its own purposes.

Question No. 1: "Why does Secretary McNamara say only 10 to 15 percent of the Vietcong's weapons have been captured—or bought—from Government troops when the State Department's interagency coordinator for Vietnam uses the figure 30 percent?"

Answer: The Times here is using a little sleight of hand to prove a point. The editorial is referring to a speech made April 19 at Detroit, Mich., by Ambassador Leonard Unger, the State Department's interagency coordinator for Vietnam. In his speech, Ambassador Unger said that the number of captured weapons in the Vietcong arsenal "have not exceeded 30 percent." Ambassador Unger was discussing the Vietcong "main force," regular troops.

Secretary McNamara, in his reference to South Vietnamese weapons captured by the Vietcong, was talking about the percentage in relation to the weapons in use by all Vietcong forces, including regular, "main force" troops and irregulars.

This distinction was clearly drawn by Deputy Director of Defense Cyrus R. Vance, in a speech at St. Louis, Mo., April 27. Referring to the role captured weapons played in the Vietcong operation, Vance said:

The great bulk of the Vietcong weapons—certainly 60 to 70 percent, including nearly all of the heavier more modern ones—come from external Communist sources.

It is true that the Vietcong use weapons cached in 1954. It is also true the South Vietnamese, from 1961 until today, have lost 39,000 weapons, but in the same period the Vietcong have lost 25,000, and so the Vietcong gains have netted them only some 14,000 arms. This is only 10 to 15 percent of their total requirements or, most favorably, only 30 of the requirements for the regular, "main force" units alone. The remainder—some 35,000 weapons for the regular, "main force" Vietcong troops, and between 50,000 and 100,000 for the Vietcong irregulars—must, and have, come from the outside.



May 3, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8951

Question No. 2: "Is it true that talk of 150,000 guerrillas conceals the intelligence that the Vietcong possesses only half that number of weapons?"

Answer: This question is more difficult to answer because it is so vague that the meaning is obscure. What it apparently means is that the U.S. Government has knowledge that there are 150,000 Vietcong guerrillas, that this country knows that only half of these guerrillas have arms and that the United States is concealing this fact from the American people.

If this is what that question means, then the answer to it is no, according to the State Department.

Question No. 3: "Why, within 48 hours of Mr. McNamara's televised assertions of bombing effectiveness, did South Vietnam's air force commander say, 'The raids against communications are not really effective. The Communists can always find ways of moving through the jungle'?"

Answer: This question implies that Mr. McNamara and the South Vietnamese air chief, Gen. Nguyen Cao Ky, are at odds. That McNamara favors the raids while the South Vietnamese do not. I am sure that the New York Times editorial writer would deny this implication since the South Vietnamese have publicly supported the air raids and General Ky himself has participated in a number of them.

The question also implies that Mr. McNamara naively believes that the raids will stop the flow of men and materials from North Vietnam into the south. This is obviously untrue. The administration has pointed out many times that the raids are designed to make this infiltration more costly and more difficult. The administration has never said that the raids will prevent all infiltration.

With these two implications disposed of, the question becomes almost innocuous. It boils down to a definition of "effectiveness." When the two statements are placed in the context in which they were uttered, it is entirely possible that they are not in conflict in any respect whatever.

It is clear that both men favor the air attacks and that both men feel that the air raids are having an effect. While it is true that the attacks will not completely stop the infiltration of men and equipment from the north, they have made such infiltration more costly, more tedious, and less certain. Both our administration and the South Vietnamese Government have noted that the attacks have inflicted great damage on North Vietnam. This has raised the morale of the South Vietnamese troops and, judging by the increase of Vietcong defectors, has had a depressing effect on morale in the North Vietnamese camp.

#### USERS ASK MORE AND BETTER ECONOMIC STATISTICS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on April 13 of this year, I took the floor to announce that the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Eco-

nomic Committee, of which I am chairman, is undertaking a review of the statistical requirements of our Nation in the light of present and future needs of the growing economy. I pointed to the need for sharpening our economic vision by securing more accurate statistical information in the future about how the economy is operating. We have hardly begun to realize the potentials of the new technology of our time in assembling, analyzing, and reproducing statistical information useful to us all.

In the course of my remarks, I asked for and received permission to have inserted in the RECORD 4 of the many letters which we have been receiving in response to our survey of over 200 professional statisticians. We asked these experts to comment on improvements needed in the quantity and quality of Federal statistics programs, possible improvements in coordination of these programs, and deficiencies that needed to be cured. The response to the survey continues to be of outstanding quality and helpfulness.

Within the next month, we plan to prepare for publication a volume containing these numerous replies, so that the entire record of suggestions and criticisms can be made available for use by the Congress, the executive agencies, and the general public.

I ask unanimous consent that four additional letters from experts with business firms be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMSTRONG CORK CO.,  
Lancaster, Pa., March 31, 1965.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Thank you for your recent letters requesting my opinion and that of my associate, Dr. A. G. Matamoros, with regard to our Nation's present and future needs for economic statistics. As a member of the Advisory Committee on Statistical Policy to the U.S. Office of Statistical Standards, I share with you the view that, in recent years, improved and expanded statistical programs have contributed to economic growth and stability by constructively influencing public and private policies. Accordingly, we are pleased to share our thoughts with you for whatever value they may have.

Among the greatest statistical gaps which today plague policy formulators are (1) employment and unemployment; (2) the giant, but fragmented, construction industry; and (3) the U.S. balance of payments.

Carefully collected data are required to measure the demand side of the labor market equation. The evidence is overwhelming that, against the background of an unsatisfactory unemployment rate, American business is suffering severe shortages of certain skilled technical workers, and many others are seeking competent employees. The further development of job vacancy data would have the obvious merit of providing guidance for public and private training and retraining programs as well as wage levels.

Despite a lot of hard work on the part of a dedicated group of Government technicians, data on construction activity are still quantitatively and qualitatively highly inadequate for the needs of policy makers. Monthly housing starts statistics, for example, continue to show so much volatility

as to make them substantially unusable for decision-making. Moreover, the elimination from consideration of a mid-decade housing inventory indicates that critically important changes in the housing stock since the last census in 1960 will not be known until well after the 1970 census is taken. Meanwhile, public and private programs are being developed and pursued to meet vague housing needs with major hazards to the Nation and the building industry. To complicate the housing quality evaluation process still further, the vast repair and modernization market is virtually unmeasured, especially since the U.S. Bureau of the Census has suspended its survey of residential additions, alterations, maintenance and repairs, and replacements. With the rebuilding of the core of American cities the greatest single economic potential for improvement in national growth, employment, and public welfare for the next generation, it is tragic that better housing data are not being aggressively pursued.

Other building and related series where considerable improvement is needed include those which purport to measure total construction put in place, housing vacancies, and construction costs.

As a member of the White House Review Committee for Balance of Payments Statistics, I want to emphasize the important data deficiencies spelled out in our report which will be released in a few weeks. Public policy in this critical area cannot be pursued properly without much more attention to, and action to solve, underlying statistical problems.

None of the foregoing suggestions is new, but then the problem of improving the accuracy of currently available economic statistics and broadening statistical coverage is not new either. There is a never-ending goal to strengthen the basis for sound policy decisions. You and your associates are to be commended for your interest and concern. Thank you very much.

Sincerely yours,

WALTER E. HOADLEY,  
Vice President and Treasurer.

THOMAS J. LIPTON, INC.,  
Englewood Cliffs, N.J., April 12, 1965.

Mr. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Economic Statistics,  
Congress of the United States,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This letter is in reply to the one which you addressed to Mr. Joseph Bradley on March 2, 1965. We in the market research department at Lipton welcome the opportunity to express our thoughts regarding the economic statistics program of the Federal Government. Changes we would like to see in the program include the following:

1. The publication of monthly figures on gross national product and its components.
2. The presentation of gross national product on a regional as well as a total U.S. basis. Data on the four major census regions would be useful.
3. More detailed breakdowns of (1) the change in business inventories and (2) net exports of goods and services (as both are defined for gross national product).
4. A more frequent publication of the detailed breakdown of personal consumption expenditures found each year in the July issue of "Survey of Current Business."
5. A quicker release of the final figures on gross national product. At present this data is published about 2 months following the end of a quarter.
6. The calculation of quarterly averages for series now presented only on a monthly basis, such as retail sales and industrial production.
7. The inclusion of data for the year-ago quarter in each publication. At present, for

example, one must refer to two separate issues of the "Survey of Current Business" in order to obtain employment figures for the year-ago quarter and the current period.

8. More frequent release of population forecasts by State. Forecasts of county populations and of incomes for States and counties would also be helpful.

9. The publication of more detailed data regarding the number of families with children of a specific age. Present age groups are too broad.

In addition, information is desired on a county basis regarding:

1. Number of grocery stores in counties with less than 500 establishments. The Census of Business already provides this data on counties with 500 establishments or more. The information requested below is also desired for all counties.

2. Number of grocery stores by type—chain vs. independent.

3. Number of grocery stores by annual retail dollar sales volume.

4. Annual retail dollar sales of just grocery items. The definition of grocery is the one employed by Progressive Grocer magazine, which divides grocery store products into groceries, fresh meats, produce, frozen foods, dairy products, bread and nonfoods.

In addition to recommending the above changes, we are also anxiously awaiting the introduction of certain improvements already endorsed by the Government. For example, at present there are two separate, noncomparable series on new construction included in "Economic Indicators." Steps are now being taken to make these two series comparable. Moreover, it is understood that some means is being sought to make seasonal adjustments in the data included in "Consumer Buying Indicators." I'm sure you realize that these refinements will make the data more meaningful and facilitate our analyses. Consequently, we are more than happy to cooperate with the Government in any way that will bring about such improvements. We hope that our suggestions have been helpful. Naturally, because our needs are constantly changing, it is quite possible that additional requests will be sent to you in the future.

Cordially,

ROBERT WIUFF,  
Market Research Department.

E. I. DU PONT DE NEMOURS & Co., Inc.,  
Wilmington, Del., March 26, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
Chairman, Subcommittee on Economic Statistics,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It is a pleasure to respond to your recent letter asking for suggestions and help in reviewing statistical requirements of business which may be supplied by agencies of the U.S. Government.

The Du Pont Co. has found that, except for a few broad economic studies, statistical data on foreign trade published by the Department of Commerce are, for the most part, far too general to provide helpful information. The basic problem in our view, is that present foreign trade statistics are classified according to a system which utilizes product categories which are very broad. Such categories include so many products that any information about a particular product, which is generally what would be of interest to a business such as ours, is usually buried and not available.

It is possible under some conditions to purchase from the Bureau of the Census statistical data on a specific product included in a category. However, in many cases this cannot be done. We would like to suggest that the Department of Commerce consider making foreign trade data available for individual products to the fullest possible extent. The Department of Commerce or some other Government agency could be a repository for individual product foreign trade data.

There would be no need to publish or distribute such data widely on an individual product basis, however, it would be available to those who wanted it for a specific product. If this Government service were widely known, it could well result in elimination of many reports presently prepared and widely distributed which are of little value.

We realize that, in some cases, for the Department of Commerce to provide more detailed information about a specific product may be difficult or even impossible because of the practice of the Department of not revealing data which might be advantageous to competitive enterprises, domestic or foreign. However, in our opinion this inability to provide specific product detail would be confined to a limited number of situations and would not seriously impair the overall usefulness of such a service.

Finally, we are also concerned about the makeup of the U.S. chemical balance of trade, particularly insofar as the U.S. chemical balance is compared from time to time with the chemical balances of other nations. This becomes important when efforts are made to assess the world trade position of the U.S. chemical industry. Today, the result is a comparison of unlike product groupings with the inference being that the comparison is a proper one. This results, for practical purposes, in no comparison at all. To a lesser extent we believe the same situation exists when the foreign trade position of the U.S. chemical industry is placed alongside that of other U.S. industries. In this case, we believe that some items are included in the U.S. chemical balance which should not be included and which properly belong in another industry. We suggest that the makeup, i.e., the items going into the U.S. chemical balance, be reexamined and reassessed in light of these considerations.

Further suggestions for improving the Census of Manufactures are the following:

Improve the indexing of reports, specifically synthetic organic chemicals and the census of manufactures.

Publish a comprehensive catalog or index to the statistical data compiled by all U.S. governmental agencies.

Publish a list of personnel in various collecting agencies who can be contacted for answers to questions concerning data.

Expand the amount of data given for many products in the so-called basket categories, especially in synthetic organic chemicals and various tariff reports without, of course, revealing production of any individual companies.

In more general areas, we believe there should be improvement in construction statistics, including housing starts, additions and alterations to residential structures, etc. While, admittedly, it is difficult to get data in such broad areas that will be meaningful for the entire country, we believe the present data could be substantially improved.

Data on retail sales should be similarly improved. The early data released on retail sales are later revised substantially. Could not a sampling method be devised to arrive at a firm figure sooner than those now available?

The wholesale price index of the chemical and allied products industry should be expanded to cover a broader sample of commodities actually moving in the industry. The composition of this index has not been revised for several years and many new products have become important during this time.

Employment and unemployment data should be prepared in a form which would stress unemployment among adult male members of the labor force rather than combining them with teenagers, working wives, etc., when many of these latter groups are looking only for parttime work. In addition, could we not provide data on unfilled job opportunities, particularly for semiskilled

and unskilled workers? The magnitude of normal seasonal unemployment should be available from the data; i.e., construction workers in northern areas during the winter months, schoolteachers in summer, etc. Finally, I believe the unemployment statistics should provide data on educational levels of the unemployed, since a low level of education is an important cause of insufficient employment. In short, should not the unemployment data point more clearly to desirable solutions to the unemployment problem, rather than merely providing facts?

The Federal budget should be presented in a more meaningful way, to show the magnitude and variety of activities being described. It is difficult now, for example, to determine the cost of various agricultural programs, or the extent of Federal lending agencies, or the extent of Federal participation in business-type activities, etc.

A similar statement could be made about the Nation's balance-of-payments problem. The experts should agree on what is to be included and how it is to be presented. For example, should Government giveaways under Public Law 480 be included as exports? Of course, the goods are shipped abroad, but their inclusion in exports gives a false picture of the number of dollars generated by our export trade.

We need faster data on corporate profits. It is now the end of the first calendar quarter of 1965, and very little corporate profit data are yet available for the fourth quarter of 1964. Could not a sampling plan be developed to provide useful estimates of corporate profits in a period in less than 3 months after the close of the period?

Finally, I believe it would be more desirable for Government agencies to attempt to provide more and better data desired by business and to be less concerned to develop data to show changes in the concentration ratios of industry.

Sincerely yours,

IRA T. ELLIS, *Economist.*

DEERE & Co.,  
Moline, Ill., March 31, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: Please excuse my delay in responding to your invitation of March 2 to participate in your review of our country's statistical requirements.

The work of the staff of the joint committee in initiating the gaps study in 1948, and indirectly in its many reports, has, I am sure, greatly stimulated improvements in the range and quality of our statistics.

To the extent that gaps listed in the 1948 study have not been closed and recommendations of the Intensive Review Committee to the Secretary of Commerce in its appraisal of Census programs in February 1954 have not been carried out, there exists a current backlog of work to be considered. In connection with the latter, it is important that work in connection with restructuring the standard industrial classification and the related commodity classification be pushed ahead at full speed. The recently published input-output tables based on 1958 data are essentially meaningless for some industries because of the classification of information on the current inadequate SIC and, incidentally, on their delay. That I think this problem is important is indicated by the following quotation from a speech I made recently at the University of Illinois:

"Capital expenditures by productive agriculturists in the future will increasingly be made for equipment produced by manufacturers who have not heretofore and are not currently classified as manufacturers of farm machinery and equipment. Components of equipment used on farms will come from the electronics and computer industries, from materials-handling equipment-producing manufacturers, and from industrial suppliers



May 3, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8953

of such conditioning equipment as humidifying, dehumidifying, cooling, etc. To the extent that these trends develop, it is clear that we will have more difficulty than ever in obtaining well-defined records of capital expenditures related to agricultural production. Agricultural product-producers' records may be helpful, but they will record such diversity as to be very difficult to consolidate."

For many years most of my work has been in the general area of prices and agricultural statistics.

Our country's price statistics are deficient in a number of ways and provide in too much detail in some cases. The Consumer Price Index, for instance, has recently been revised along lines as recommended by a special committee established to review Government price indexes. It is inadequate, however, as a retail price index, which would be helpful for policy purposes, and is probably not necessary for as many cities for which it is published. Ten to twenty years from now separate city indexes will probably not be necessary; some regional indexes may be helpful.

The index of prices paid by farmers for cost-of-living items has probably outlived its usefulness and could be supplanted by regional Consumer Price Indexes. Indexes of prices of imports and of exports not now available will be helpful in the years ahead.

A great many statistics, including those collected and disseminated by the Bureau of the Census and the Department of Agriculture should be examined and modified in the light of future needs rather than maintained so strongly in the context of the criteria of historical consistency. A parity index, for instance, based on 1910-14 is anachronistic. A definition of farms as commercial which set as little as \$50 worth of products is scarcely a useful definition in the modern world, especially when Census publications provide no breakdowns in the economic classification of farms selling products with a value of \$40,000 or more.

Farm income, as measured by the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Internal Revenue, vary because of differences in the purposes of the data collection. A study of the differences might result in better guides to future policy or administrative decisions.

Many Government statistical reports that summarize activity in industry or product groups are published so late that the reports have little value, even though businesses bear the burdensome costs of reporting. These kinds of observations and suggestions can be extended almost endlessly. Your committee might get its greatest assistance, however, from extending the context of your current review by asking your staff to describe in broad-brush strokes what our economy will be like by 1985, and then asking representatives of various professions to present papers discussing such questions as: "What kind of policy problems and administrative needs will we then face for which foundation statistical data should be laid now? What kinds of data are we now collecting or presenting that can and should be greatly modified or even discontinued?"

I hope that the joint committee will continue its activities aimed at improving our statistics.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER S. KELLOGG,  
Director of Economic Research.

## VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Friday last, the distinguished majority leader, together with the distinguished minority

leader, offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute and suggested that we study the changes over the weekend. I believe that was a useful and helpful action on their part.

If the majority leader is now willing, it is my purpose to raise certain questions in an effort to clarify one of the changes which has been made in the substitute bill.

I wonder whether the Senator from Montana is in a position to accommodate us at this time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to do my best.

Mr. HART. The first question relates to the substitute to section 4(a), under the leadership substitute amendment to section 4(a). Could a covered State lift the prohibition on tests and devices by deciding to conduct a complete reregistration? Would that constitute effective correction of the effects of discrimination? I believe that there are court decisions indicating that testing might be resumed if a reregistration is ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. A mere order for reregistration would not constitute an effective correction of anything. The fact that a State decides to have a reregistration would not be enough to persuade a court that a State had met the very heavy burden imposed on it under the amended escape clause. We do not mean merely to codify such decisions as United States against Louisiana and United States against Duke, which do not foreclose resumption of tests after a complete reregistration has been ordered. We mean to require much more than that.

Mr. HART. Let me ask the Senator where in his amendment that is made clear.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In two places. First, it requires that the effects of past discrimination must have been effectively—and I emphasize the word "effectively"—corrected. The creation of an abstract equality of opportunity to register without discrimination—which is all a decision to have a reregistration amounts to—would not be "effective" correction by itself. No correction would be considered effective until, at a minimum, persons of voting age desirous of voting were actually voting after having been registered without discrimination.

Second, the substitute amendment requires that there be "no reasonable cause to believe" that any test or device "will be used for the purpose or will have the effect of" violating the 15th amendment. A decision to reregister everybody obviously fails to meet this test, since in States with a long record of voting discrimination it is highly probable that discrimination will continue even under a reregistration. The court will, of course, look to see what officials will be responsible for carrying out the new registration. I would think that a State, in which a number of findings of discrimination have been made by the courts, would find it difficult to meet this test.

The only way a State could prove that a test or device would not be used for the purpose of discriminating would be actually to conduct registration or reregistration without tests over a period of

time without any racial discrimination. A sufficient period of time is necessary so that the court may have before it statistics showing the fact of nondiscrimination in voting.

The so-called 60-percent provision provided that a State might bring itself out by proving that 60 percent of the voting age population became registered and there "is" no denial of the right to vote on account of race or color. This might have been read to mean that reregistration would satisfy the "is" test since no person would remain enrolled who had been favored in the past. The 60 percent provision did not look to the past or future. That is one reason we deleted it.

Mr. HART. Does the elimination of the 5-year suspension provision mean that a shorter suspension period is envisioned under the leadership substitute?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not necessarily. In cases where there has been discrimination in the past in only one county of a State—if there are such cases—perhaps 5 years would be too long. But in the hard-core areas—where a number of cases have been brought and findings of discrimination made—nothing in the leadership substitute would prevent a longer suspension period, where necessary.

This is another reason we eliminated the 60-percent escape hatch—it might have been construed to permit the hard-core States to resume the use of tests and devices within a short time.

Mr. HART. Under the leadership substitute, would your answer be the same as to the meaning and intent of the words "effect" and "effectively" used in section 4(a) respecting denial or abridgment of the right to vote as it applied to the 25-percent provision of section 4(b)(3); that in 25-percent areas, notwithstanding the presence, absence or suspension of tests, "where Negroes have been intimidated and discouraged over the years from even trying to register, they must be given time to make that effort?"

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. HART. Can the Attorney General move within 5 years after judgment to reopen a case involving a 25-percent area even if a test or device has never been used, if he believes that the right to vote is being abridged because of race or color?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. In such a case, he need not allege that a test or device was being used because that was never the criterion for including such an area. He can move to reopen at any time within 5 years if he believes that discrimination or its effects have not been effectively eliminated.

Mr. HART. May the courts look at the content of any test a State proposes to use, as well as its probable mode of administration?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, definitely; the two cannot be separated. Arbitrary tests, tests vesting a good deal of discretion in the registrar, and otherwise unreasonable or too-difficult tests lend themselves too readily to manipulation and often have an inherent discriminatory effect. We would expect the courts to take that into account and to refuse

to approve such concoctions as the "perfect form" requirement now used in three States, and the like.

Mr. HART. Should the courts consider the education gap that exists in some of these States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say yes; that is a good example of a factor to be considered when reviewing the content of a proposed test or device.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield for a question on that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan has the floor.

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the majority leader if that would not create discrimination in favor of nonwhites against whites in the administration of the act?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; that is not the intention of this provision.

Mr. ERVIN. I understood the Senator from Michigan to ask the Senator from Montana whether the courts should consider the education gap between the races in determining whether or not people should be allowed to register to vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The education gap that exists in some of those States.

Mr. ERVIN. That means, because of the education gap, that it would discriminate in favor of nonwhites and against whites. We ought not to create a new discrimination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would not say that it would be really a new discrimination, because it is based on the achievement of the tests. It is a matter which ought to be considered, because of its effect at the present time in some States.

Mr. HART. Why does the leadership substitute delete from section 7(a) the requirement adopted by the Judiciary Committee that an application must allege that an applicant for listing "has been deprived of the right to register or vote on account of race or color"?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because the effect of that language was somewhat uncertain. We did not feel that any question of what motive State officials might have had for rejecting an applicant should be interjected into the examiner proceedings. An application to a referee under the 1960 Civil Rights Act does not require such an allegation, and we saw no reason to require it here.

Mr. HART. The leadership substitute added to section 7(b) an explicit requirement that State election officials must place on their official voting list the names listed by an examiner. Why was that requirement added?

Mr. MANSFIELD. For two reasons.

First. We sought to make clear that we expect State officials to treat persons listed by examiners in accordance with the same orderly procedures as they apply to other registered voters, and that would include placing their names on the official voting list.

Second. We added in section 10 authority for the Attorney General to file a suit if 20 days before an election federally listed persons have not been placed on the official State list. Naturally we had to impose a duty on local officials to so place those names. The purpose of this lawsuit is to provide some assurance

in advance of an election that listed persons will be allowed to vote. I wish to point out, however, that it is a person's listing by an examiner that entitles him to vote; placing his name on the official voting list maintained by State or local officials is not a prerequisite to his entitlement to vote. Failure to place his name on the State list, however, is evidence of an intention not to allow persons listed by an examiner to vote; that is why we have imposed a mandatory duty on State and local officials to place those names on the State list. Action under section 10 is, of course, only one of the alternative remedies available under the bill.

Mr. HART. I thank the distinguished majority leader for making clear his purpose and intention, and that of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] in offering the substitute.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, unless the Senator wishes to withdraw the order for the quorum call for the purpose of making a speech, I shall object.

Mr. JAVITS. I shall make a speech.

Mr. ERVIN. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if it will not interfere with the Senator from North Carolina, for he may desire the floor or have the floor—

Mr. ERVIN. No, I do not have the floor.

Mr. JAVITS. If it is agreeable with the Senator, I should like to make a few statements.

This is the first time that I shall have commented upon the substitute filed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] which is popularly known as the leadership substitute.

First, the substitute is further evidence of the seriousness with which the leadership in this body has taken the views of the so-called liberals who have taken the position that it is high time, in the interest of the Nation, that we have a really effective voting rights bill. We have had the acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. The old line of leaving it entirely to the eventuations of court proceedings has not seemed to work; so we have had to do something else.

In my judgment, the substitute is a material improvement over the bill sent to Congress by the administration. Although in effect it "leapfrogged" the bill reported by the committee, the Senate has full power to seek to amend the substitute if it can be whipped into shape, and then to accept it, in lieu of the bill that came from committee, or, if the Senate cannot effectively amend the substitute so as to suit it, it has the right to reject it. Then we shall again revert to the committee bill, to which amendments will lie, and that bill can be put in shape.

I believe it is the duty of those of us who desire to bring about the result within a reasonable period of time, in view of the distinguished auspices under which the substitute is presented to us, to address ourselves to it, and to do so promptly and with what I hope will prove to be good effect.

The things that I think are noteworthy as well as the things that give us concern are the following: It is noteworthy that the so-called 60-percent escape clause has now been taken out of the substitute. This is most gratifying and represents, again, what we all feel about the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. He is not a slave even to his own ideas, but may be persuaded, either in the interest of harmony or of the basic substantive questions involved, that some other course is the right one. I believe that this has helped greatly in our consideration of the measure.

The second thing that I think is important is that there has now been an acceptance, obviously, of the triggering mechanisms which are contained in the bill as it came from committee. This, again, represents a basic question of principle, which has now been accepted upon reconsideration by the leadership, to the effect that in order to have an effective law, which will at long last bring the right to vote to so many people who have been denied it, it is necessary to have mechanisms which will take effect within the control of the Attorney General and the governmental machinery of the United States, subject to court review, but not subject to original authority on the part of the courts. That, I believe, is a distinct gain.

Now I should like to mention the disadvantages. The first and obvious one is the reversal of the provision which allowed the Attorney General to require that an applicant attempt to register before the local authority, first. As the bill now reads, such an attempt is required unless waived by the Attorney General. Much as I prefer the former, I would not necessarily, if everything else fell into place, niggle about the latter. Therefore, subject to the rest of the bill being put in reasonable condition, I should not think that that would represent a major problem.

However, I regard the poll tax question as a major problem; and I regard the poll watchers question as a major problem.

As to the poll tax, as it is now provided for in the substitute, we are deprived of a finding by Congress as to the facts. I am one of those who believe that the facts justify the finding that the poll tax has been used as an instrument for abridging the right to vote. If Congress is to leave it to the courts, either under pending or new cases, or even directing the Attorney General to institute cases, it still means that he would have the burden of proof and must demonstrate affirmatively, absent a basic finding of fact by Congress that it is of such nature that on its face it abridges the right to vote.

So I do not agree with the strong feeling, of many that the poll tax should not be eliminated, when we consider that what Congress thought it was doing, it



May 3, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8957

Mr. ELLENDER. Are they permanent employees?

Mr. McGEE. Permanent employees of the Commission, not of the Government itself.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent have persons been employed from other departments of Government on a reimbursable basis? Are all these persons new persons the Commission is hiring?

Mr. McGEE. At the present time, we have only one such person on a reimbursable basis. In terms of phases of the problem of food marketing which have been available to the Commission, existing studies will be maintained up to date by the Federal Trade Commission, by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, and by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. ELLENDER. If my memory serves me correctly, those who sponsored the resolution last year—perhaps it was the year before—indicated that most of the employees would be connected with some Department of Government, so that this matter could be looked into at once and interim reports presented, in an effort to find out why it is that the farmers are getting so little and why it is that the chain stores are getting so much. Such information, in my judgment, would be of benefit if obtained within a few months. But, if it drags on, I do not believe that such information will do any good. I am hopeful that the Senator can give us assurance that if the Commission is extended, it will complete its work on or before July 31, 1966, and that its final reports will be ready for presentation to the Congress.

Mr. McGEE. The Commission has had unanimous conviction about the urgency of moving, and moving quickly. There was great reaction on the part of the Commission that some of the manifestations of the election required some delay. They would like to have taken care of it a year ago last summer. Circumstances seemed to operate against it. The feeling was expressed that if we started going at it too vigorously in the middle of an election, there would be those who might suggest that it would become a political football. We did not wish that to happen to this particular Commission. We believe that these problems are more complex and larger than a political party or political partisanship. Let me give my assurance to the Senator—and I believe I sense the attitude of the other 14 members of the Commission—that they are not about to prolong this matter unnecessarily, because it has taken a great deal of time, a great deal of digging. Every member of the Commission knows what he is supposed to be doing. Their sense of dedication to the importance of this particular question has led the Commission to place priority on the problem, in terms of getting it moving, but getting it moving in a constructive way in the hope that we can reach conclusions which will be helpful to all segments of the marketing structure.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hope that the work of the Commission can be completed in the time stated in the bill of

my good friend, the Senator from Wyoming, who has been giving a great deal of attention to the problem, and that he will be able to point with pride to the Commission that was organized. It said it would get its work done in 2 years, and here it is.

As the Senator from Wyoming knows, when we had debate on this subject it was my feeling that in order for the facts to be of benefit and get results, they would have to be presented very shortly.

Mr. McGEE. Yes. I assure the Senator from Louisiana that we intend to brook no unnecessary delays. If we can work double time, we shall make that endeavor. But I would mention as a qualifying observation that as one goes into the complexities of the situation the difficulty in terms of separating one phase of the problem from another, trying to isolate some aspects of the problem becomes more and more obvious to all. This is not news to the Senator from Louisiana, who has lived with such a problem for a long time. He is one of the great experts in the Senate on agricultural problems. He understands them with great grasp.

Mr. ELLENDER. I was not looking for any bouquets. The point is that I know the seriousness of the problem. The answers should be obtained tomorrow if possible. We must not wait until 3 or 4 years hence for them to be of any use.

Mr. McGEE. I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. We should have had the answers yesterday. If we could have made them available yesterday, we would have done so. I was not intending to give the Senator bouquets; I was merely trying to state the facts. The facts add up to a bouquet, nonetheless.

But that is not the point. I was merely trying to suggest that these questions are being injected at this point out of a great sense of perspective for the depth of the problem; and I believe that the Record should show it.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the Senator will look up the formation of some of these committees, particularly some that were appointed to investigate various needs, he will find that they have asserted they would get the jobs done in 12 months or some other specified time, and in so doing have been able to induce many Senators to go along with them. I do not wish to repeat it too often—the Senator was not in the Senate at the time—but I will remember the creation of the Juvenile Delinquency Committee, which was supposed to complete its work in not more than 2 years. That was 15 years ago. It is still a committee which seems to be important, is doing a great deal of work, and is spending a great deal of the Government's money. However, I express the hope that the committee will complete its work by June 30, 1966.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his interest in this program as well as his remarks in regard to its present status, and to assure him that the Commission has no intention of dragging its feet.

I happen to be a member of another special and select committee which was created not long ago—since I became a

Member of the Senate. I refer to the Committee on Water Resources, which was created for 2 years. Not only did the committee complete its job in 2 years, under the leadership of the late distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, Robert Kerr, but it also turned back some of the funds which Congress had made available.

I know of no mark of real, great care that would be more a matter of pride to members of the President's Food Marketing Commission than to be able to achieve a measure of good judgment and economy.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, although he is a member of the Commission on Water Resources, I also happen to be a member.

Mr. McGEE. It would be difficult to select a committee in this body on which the distinguished Senator from Louisiana does not serve.

Mr. ELLENDER. We worked alone to try to reach the goal and complete the task by the date fixed.

If the Commission composed of five Senators, five Representatives, and five persons from the outside continues with its good work, I have no doubt that it can complete all of its studies on or before June 30, 1966.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as I conclude, I believe it worth noting that in the Senate we had no illusions about the work that might be required, and we have been forthright about it. We believed that it would take 2 years and a amount of dollars, and I am suggesting it has not been a bad guess up until now. We intend to live up to the estimate we made in the projection of that time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 174), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to extend for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress and to provide necessary authorization of appropriation for the Commission. In extending the life of the Commission to July 1, 1966, with a total authorization of \$2,500,000, the bill conforms to President Johnson's original proposal submitted to Congress April 1, 1964, and passed by the Senate May 18, 1964.

In order to get the Commission study underway, the Senate concurred in House amendments limiting the authorization to 1 year and \$1.5 million, with the understanding that an additional 1-year extension would be sought during this session of Congress.

The Commission received no funds until October 7, 1964. Because of the inability of the original Chairman to serve, due to health reasons, the selection of an executive director for the Commission was delayed until November 18, 1964. This also delayed the organizational meeting of the Commis-

8958

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

May 3, 1965

sion which took place on January 7, 1965. It was not until this date that the Commission approved staff appointments and considered the broad outlines of its program.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from North Carolina for his great courtesy in yielding to me to call up the bill.

#### PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S POLICIES IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column written by Kenneth Crawford and published in this week's Newsweek magazine, dated May 10, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### KIDDING THE KIDS (By Kenneth Crawford)

It would be unrealistic to expect youth to learn from the experience of age. Each new generation must learn for itself and from its own experience, not from example or preaching. Why, then, should anyone be surprised that a vocal segment of the student population is protesting President Johnson's policies in southeast Asia? Why should a bright college student, eager to start a civilian career, be attracted by the prospect of soldiering in Asia? Yet this is the prospect he will face if the limited war now going on in Vietnam becomes prelude to big war.

His reluctance is understandable. What is not so understandable is the guidance he is getting from many faculty members at teach-ins and from academicians marketing their advice on national policy to journals of opinion. Unless the learned are incapable of learning from events, professors should know from the world's experience during the last quarter century that wars are not prevented by running away from aggressors during the early stages of an aggression. They do the student no service by clothing his aversion to jungle war in the habiliments of idealism.

#### FACTS ARE FACTS

That is what they are doing when they equate denunciation of bombing raids against North Vietnam with the cause of civil rights in the United States. That is what they are doing when they suggest that an American plane dropping bombs on a North Vietnamese bridge or on a Vietcong concentration in South Vietnam is an evil comparable with systematic terrorization of South Vietnamese villagers, 9,750 of whom were murdered or abducted by the Vietcong in 1964.

What is even less understandable is the ignorance of facts or the determination not to be influenced by facts which characterizes much of the professorial comment on Vietnam. There is, for example, the repeated assertion that the South Vietnamese Army, which has sustained more casualties per man engaged than the United States suffered in Korea, won't fight. There is the reiterated statement that the war in the south is an indigenous revolution, in no way the product of aggression from the north, which is belied by irrefutable evidence that Hanoi directs, supplies, and increasingly mans the insurgency. A captured document disclosed that Hanoi itself concedes: "The revolution for liberation of the south would never succeed if the [Communist] Party were not directing it."

The major premise of the teach-inners seems to be that Red China's manifest destiny, given its population and resources, is to overrun southeast Asia and that to resist this movement is to defy an immutable law of nature. The same argument was made

against interfering with Hitler's bid for elbow room, and against arming Turkey and helping Greece when Stalin menaced them—sometimes by the same scholars who are now saying that we are hopelessly overextended trying to police the world.

#### EAST IS EAST

Even though intervention stopped Hitler and slowed Stalin, the teachers now tell their students that intervention won't work in Asia because East is East and West is West and the Asians hate whites even more than Hindus hate Moslems of the same complexion, which is frightening if true. But if it is true, then we whites haven't much future in this world because we are a small and shrinking minority of the human race.

Within the framework of China's inevitable expansion, Dr. Hans Morgenthau of the University of Chicago offers us comfort. Ho Chi Minh, he says, will be a Tito, somehow remaining independent of the Chinese. Just how Ho is to accomplish this is not clear. It has something to do with his Vietnamese nationalism. True, Ho hasn't the resources that protected Tito from Stalin, but Vietnam's historic dislike of China will make him free, or so Morgenthau contends.

Dr. Kenneth Galbraith of Harvard also has an interesting, though less important, idea. He told his teach-in audience that President Johnson is a victim of the wrong advice from the wrong people. Is it possible he doesn't know who's in charge here?

Somebody should tell the taught-in college boys of 1965 that their feeling about Vietnam, while natural, isn't noble. Their fathers, perhaps.

#### VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, on Thursday last I addressed the members of this body to set forth my conviction that we have seen increasing signs in recent weeks which indicate that the restrained yet forceful policies of the Johnson administration are beginning to have a positive effect upon the outcome of the conflict in Vietnam. In those remarks, I suggested that any national debate based on the situation as it was in February, rather than as it is today, ignores substantial changes without which any debate would be less than productive and informative.

As an example of some of the changes in the status of affairs in the Far East, I cite an article published in the April 30 edition of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, a journal noted for thoughtful and liberal judgments on the world around it. This article pointed out that it is becoming apparent that many nations of the world, which in most circumstances are sympathetic to the aspirations of the Red Chinese, are greatly disturbed by the contrast between Peiping's intransigence on the subject of negotiations and President Lyndon Johnson's demonstrated willingness to enter into unconditional negotiations at the earliest opportunity. The article suggests that this attitude may lead to the isolation of Red China from many of the nations it once counted as friends.

In addition, this article presents a thoughtful analysis of the reasons behind Red Chinese militancy which is most useful in any analysis of the Vietnamese question.

Mr. President, I believe that this article is a further indication of the fact that we are following the right course

in Vietnam and in Asia, and that this course should be maintained. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch,  
Apr. 30, 1965]

RED CHINA'S ADAMANT OPPOSITION TO NEGOTIATED VIETNAM ACCORD LEADING TO AN ISOLATED PEIPING—EVEN SYMPATHETIC ASIANS NOTE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN JOHNSON'S WILLINGNESS TO TALK AND CHOU'S INSISTENCE ON A FIGHT

HONG KONG, April 30.—Peiping newspapers have documented what analysts here describe as the drift of Communist China toward international isolation on the Vietnam issue.

The estrangement may even apply to North Vietnam, which is balking at Peiping's uncompromising opposition to a negotiated settlement of the Vietnamese war.

The Soviet Union was the principal target on Peiping's front pages this week. A statement accused Moscow of collaborating with the United States to frustrate the Vietcong insurgents.

This sweeping castigation took in all Communist countries and parties adhering to the Soviet ideological doctrine.

The news given greatest prominence was a statement last Saturday by Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodian chief of state, in which he objected to using a proposed international conference on his country as a forum for discussions on Vietnam.

This is a propaganda technique that Peiping has employed in working against the Soviet proposal for a conference on Cambodia. The proposal has been accepted by Britain and the United States and approved in principle by North Vietnam.

Asians, including those who are friendly to the Chinese Communists, have been thrust into making a comparison between U.S. willingness to talk peace and Peiping's aloofness.

Many of these Asians saw in their newspapers or heard on their radios the statements by President Lyndon B. Johnson offering to talk about peace unconditionally with any government. They also saw or heard Peiping's denunciation of the President as a "hatchetman" and its attack on the Soviet leaders for suggesting that Mr. Johnson was a sensible man.

The Chinese Communists insisted in their statement that the Vietnamese insurgents must fight until the U.S. forces were completely defeated and compelled to withdraw. Only then, the statement said, should they embark on any peace talks.

The Soviet suggestion, which is implied in Moscow's more flexible attitude toward negotiations, that the Vietnamese Communists may be able to obtain at the conference table what has eluded them on the battlefield was dismissed by Peiping with the assertion that peaceful coexistence with the United States was impossible.

In its statement, Peiping spurned the Soviet appeal of last Thursday for "united action," which would have strengthened Communist military and diplomatic backing for North Vietnam. This would suggest that Communist China has higher priorities than those assigned to their comrades in Hanoi, the North Vietnam capital, and to the Vietcong in South Vietnam.

Analysts here cite two explanations of Peiping's demand for a protracted war, although the Vietnamese Communists might find a negotiated settlement more advantageous at this time.

Ideologically, a U.S. military debacle in South Vietnam is required to confirm the Chinese Communist thesis that armed revo-



May 3, 1965

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

8959

lutionaries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America can win regardless of U.S. military power.

As for Chinese Communist national interests, there would be less advantage obtainable from a negotiated U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam, because this would leave other American positions in Asia relatively unimpaired.

Frustrated by the lack of the military means of ejecting the United States from such adjacent areas as Taiwan, Okinawa, and Thailand, Peiping sees in Vietnam an opportunity to unhinge by psychological means the entire U.S. position in east Asia.

Peiping has not concealed its belief that disaster in Vietnam might swing U.S. opinion toward abandonment of the policy of containment to halt the spread of communism.

Diplomatic observers in London believe that Red China is marking time on a commitment for Vietnam peace talks, pending the Algiers conference of African-Asian nations in June.

Peiping has given mounting indications that it is out to gain maximum support from African-Asian leaders for its "Americans get out of Asia" campaign.

Premier Chou En-lai is pushing the issue and has been traveling to African and Asian capitals to make sure that the conference takes place and that Chinese counsel prevails.

At the same time he has been making every effort to keep the Russians out of the Algiers meeting, to isolate the Kremlin leadership from the Africans and Asians.

So far, conflicting interests among the Africans and Asians have delayed a final decision on the composition of the conference and its agenda.

Peiping will push for a strong declaration condemning the United States alleged imperialist aggression in Asia and in the Congo, and urging American unconditional withdrawal from Vietnam, Communist diplomats said.

Chou said yesterday that the Johnson administration wanted to use the proposed conference on Cambodia "to continue its efforts to induce the Vietnamese people to submit."

In a dispatch from Peiping, monitored in London, the New China News Agency quoted Chou as saying that the Chinese Government fully supported the stand taken by Prince Sihanouk and the royal Cambodian Government on such a conference.

"In any circumstances," Chou said, "it is absolutely impermissible for U.S. imperialism to legalize its puppet regime in Saigon by thrusting it into an international conference."

## VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, we are dealing with one of the most peculiar pieces of proposed legislation that the Senate has ever had before it.

In 1957 I spoke against the broad civil rights bill which was under consideration by the Senate at the time. In the course of my remarks, I stated that the unceasing agitation about matters of race in the United States was impairing our national sanity. The pending bill, in my judgment, constitutes conclusive proof of the truth of the observation I made at that time. As a result of certain demonstrations, our Nation now finds itself in a period of national hysteria. I do not honestly believe that there is any

other word that can be used to describe the situation.

Some weeks ago the President of the United States appeared one evening before a joint session of Congress and demanded the speedy passage of a voting rights bill. He assured us that the bill would contain a simple uniform test, which could be applied to all the 50 States of the Union, to determine whether or not nonwhites were having their right to vote denied or abridged on account of their race or color, in violation of the provisions of the 15th amendment to the Constitution.

I do not know when the original bill was written, but subsequent events satisfy me that it was not even in existence at the time the President made his speech. I say that because I tried to obtain a copy of the bill to which the President referred and was unable to obtain a copy until several days after the President's speech. I then discovered that instead of creating a simple uniform test of discrimination, the bill was so drawn as to discriminate against seven States and in favor of 43.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad to yield to my able and distinguished friend from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not a fact that five versions of the bill were written before the committee acted, that the committee submitted to the Senate the sixth version of the bill, and that now we have a substitute pending for the committee bill, which makes the seventh version of the bill?

Mr. ERVIN. According to the information which I have received, the facts implied by the question of the able and distinguished Senator from Georgia are correct.

I can testify of my own knowledge that we are now considering the fourth version of the bill, which I have had to deal with as a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Senate. When that bill was originally introduced, it bore all the earmarks of haste. Even the words in which the bill was couched showed lack of consideration for the plain meaning of words.

When the bill first came before the Judiciary Committee, I pointed out to the Attorney General that the bill applied to certain States and political subdivisions of States. I asked the Attorney General, in substance, if he wanted the Department of Justice, acting on behalf of the Federal Government, to become embroiled in every political subdivision of the States covered by the bill. I asked him if he realized that the bill was so broad that it would confer jurisdiction upon the Federal Government to intervene in every ward of every city and town covered by the bill.

I pointed out to him that it would not only cover every ward in every city and town in the area covered by the bill, but would also cover every school district, every sanitary district, and every special bond district.

The Attorney General informed me that the administration did not intend any such thing as that.

I pointed out to him that that was exactly what the bill would accomplish under the phraseology used.

I have never seen such loose language used in proposed legislation. If there were a race for justice of the peace or dogcatcher in any township in the area covered by the bill, and less than 50 percent of the people in the township of voting age had voted, the power of the Federal Government would be called into play under the terms of the bill. The Attorney General said that the administration did not intend to project the Federal power into the wards of the towns and cities, or in any race for justice of the peace or dogcatcher, that they did not intend to go below the grade of county or parish.

I said to him, "You had better amend your bill." I am glad to say that the bill has been amended in that respect.

One thing I have never understood about politics in public affairs is why public officials are so thirsty for power. If we give them a little power, they want more. That was the primary reason why the Founding Fathers gave us a written Constitution. They knew from their study of history that the insatiable thirst of government for power would destroy freedom unless government were restrained by law which it could neither repeal nor abrogate.

However, there is one unfortunate feature about a written constitution. The Founding Fathers wrote a Constitution with a twofold purpose. The first purpose was to define the powers of the government which they were creating. The other was to protect the people of this Nation against an abuse of those powers. In addition, the Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution a provision that every official had to be bound by a solemn oath or affirmation to support the Constitution. They inserted that provision because they realized that a constitution could not be self-executing. They knew it had to be left to men for its effectuation.

As I have said, the pending measure is one of the most peculiar bills I have ever seen. After the bill was introduced, the Senate took a course of action which is incompatible with good legislation. By an overwhelming vote, the Senate placed a time limitation upon the search for wise legislation in the voting rights field. The Senate said, "You must report this bill back by April 9." The Senate added, "It does not make any difference whether you have had adequate consideration of the bill; it does not make any difference whether you have given the States and the political subdivisions of the States to be affected by the bill an opportunity to present their side of the case by that day. So far as the Judiciary Committee is concerned, you will have reached the ultimate limit of the search for truth on April 9."

When the bill was brought before the committee, there appeared in the bill provisions which would have created new

crimes and which would have subjected men to years of imprisonment and to exorbitant fines for such crimes without a single requirement in the bill that those men should have a criminal intent. For example, the bill contained a provision that no election official could alter or change any election record. Under that provision an official could not have changed an election record of any kind, even to make it speak the truth, if he found that a mistake had been made in tabulating the vote. In addition, there was a provision which would have made a State election official subject to imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary and to an exorbitant fine if he carried out the provision of the Constitution permitting the administration of the literacy test in an area to which the bill applied.

(At this point Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, also included in the bill was a provision under which, if an election record were destroyed by accident and without design the election official responsible for the accidental act could be sent to the penitentiary and subjected to an enormous fine.

As a result of those facts being pointed out during the course of the hearings, the bill was amended so as to require a criminal intent on the part of persons charged with crimes under the bill.

Another peculiar provision appeared in that bill. That provision was that if any person claimed that he had been denied the right to vote in an election, a suit could be brought to enjoin the certification of the results of that election; but the court could not decide the case in the first instance on the facts.

The court was bound to accept the allegation of the district attorney and issue an injunction against the certification of any of the election results.

The absurdity of that provision is evident from a consideration of the case of an election including candidates for the office of justice of the peace in a township as well as candidates for the governorship of a State. On the returns, a candidate for Governor may have had a 250,000 majority. Yet if one man made a protest that he had been denied the right to vote, even if his vote could not possibly have affected the result, the court would have had to issue an injunction at the request of the district attorney staying the certification of the results of the election in all respects.

Fortunately, that provision has been removed from the bill.

As I have said, the bill is a most peculiar piece of proposed legislation. We have reached a tragic state in this country. One hundred years after Appomattox, we have a hysteria abroad in the land which, I regret to say, influences the action of public men. This perhaps would have been understandable 100 years ago; but is not understandable to me today.

In connection with the bill now before the Senate and other civil rights bills, we have suffered even a loss of our two-party system of government in the United States. Throughout the history of this Nation we have had the benefit of a two-party system of government. We

have had one party in power in charge of administration; we have had another party out of power. Throughout its history, until the advent of modern so-called civil rights bills, this country enjoyed the blessings of a two-party system. Mr. President, that was a blessing of no mean proportions.

I make that statement because the party out of power rendered great service to our Nation by pointing out defects in the legislative proposals of the administration in power. That is a great service. We have a situation in respect to modern so-called civil rights bills in which we no longer have a two-party system. We have a situation in which both parties cosponsor bills of this nature. The majority leadership and the minority leadership in the Senate and in the House of Representatives are as alike as two peas in the same political pod. So we no longer have the benefit of two opposing parties fulfilling their respective roles. This is true because, when the leaders of the opposition party cosponsor an administration bill, they put themselves in a position in which they are not free to study and to point out the defects in the administration proposal. When that condition exists, the value of an opposition party to this country in large measure ceases.

The bill has many defects, but to my mind the overriding defect is that it degrades certain States and subdivisions of States to the point where they are denied fundamental rights which everyone, by common consent, would afford even to those charged with the foulest crimes against our Nation.

The bill gives me much concern. Such concern does not arise merely out of the fact that I have the honor to represent, in part, one of the States which are unjustly brought within the legislative condemnation that the bill visits, either totally or in part, upon seven States that used to be considered sovereign. I also have concern about the bill because I am an American who believes in the system of government ordained by our Constitution. I am concerned on that score because the bill indicates, according to my opinion, that love for the Constitution is dying in the hearts of many people in high places in the United States.

Judge Learned Hand said that when liberty dies in the hearts of the people, no constitution, no law, no court can save it. I say that when love for constitutional principles dies in the hearts of men in high places, the Constitution becomes a dead letter.

I said a moment ago that the bill degrades States and political subdivisions of States to the point where they have fewer rights than those charged with the foulest crimes known to our law. Actually, the bill puts 34 counties of North Carolina in a more degraded legal status than would be enjoyed by a person charged with selling our atomic secrets to the Soviet Union.

I wish to read amendment V and amendment VI of the Constitution for the purpose of showing that I am on solid ground when I say that the bill manifests

a greater contempt for States and political subdivisions of States than our law manifests for a person charged with treason against this country. Amendment V reads as follows:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a grand jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces, or in the militia, when in actual service in time of war or public danger; nor shall any person be subject for the same offense to be twice put in jeopardy of life or limb; nor shall be compelled in any criminal case to be a witness against himself, nor be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.

Amendment VI reads as follows:

In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Under those constitutional provisions and the principles of the common law which they embody, a person charged with treason against the United States is presumed to be innocent until proven guilty. In that respect, he is accorded a privilege far above that accorded by the bill to certain States and political subdivisions of States. I say this because the bill creates an artificial formula under which seven States of the Union, either in whole or in part, are presumed to be guilty of violating the 15th amendment, and are compelled to prove their innocence in order to enjoy their constitutional prerogatives.

Under the provisions of the Constitution which I have read to the Senate, a person charged with treason against the United States must be tried in the district in which he is alleged to have committed the crime. Under the bill, the States and political subdivisions of States are condemned without a judicial trial and without evidence and are then denied access to every court on the face of the earth except the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia.

Under the bill, every U.S. district judge exercising jurisdiction in the areas condemned by the bill is prohibited from acting in his judicial office in respect to any matter arising under the terms of the bill. I asked the Attorney General the reason for this provision. He gave the excuse that it was desired to have interpretations of the bill uniform; therefore, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia was chosen for this purpose.

With all due respect to the Attorney General, I say that that excuse is intellectual rubbish. I say that for the reason that there are nine separate circuits in the United States in which courts sit for the interpretation and enforcement of Federal law. If the excuse given by the Attorney General for denying jurisdiction to all of the Federal judges who live

# Appendix

## "Head Start" Admits Child to Wonderful World

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, many critics of the Nation's war on poverty have delighted in pointing up problems in the organization of this massive new Federal program. It is refreshing to read of the successes of the war, such as a recent article about the new Operation Head Start in the Commercial Appeal of Memphis.

Under unanimous consent, I include this article at this point in the RECORD: [From the Memphis (Tenn.) Commercial Appeal, Apr. 25, 1965]

HEAD START ADMITS CHILD TO WONDERFUL WORLD

(By Clayton Braddock)

The frail, sad-eyed little boy was withdrawn and shy. His eyes, set wide and white against his dark skin, reflected the turmoil he felt inside.

But then he saw the huge aircraft lift gracefully from the long runway and slowly disappear into the sky.

The boy's imagination and part of his fears soared with the big jet. It was the first one he had ever seen.

"He changed. He became a leader. He just took over the whole bunch," said Mrs. Annette Roberts, principal of Hamilton Elementary School where the boy now attends first-grade classes.

That eye-opening experience took place last summer when 34 children from impoverished homes in the Hamilton High School area were introduced to the world in a "readiness" program for preschool children.

It is this kind of child—to whom the world is a big scary expanse—a few blocks from the gloom of poverty—which the \$50 million Federal program, Project Head Start, will try to help.

A Memphis-Shelby County committee has applied for \$1,183,191 to launch a program for 7,170 preschool children in poverty-bound areas of the city and county.

A few small programs have been set up in individual schools in the past two summers, but with limited funds and personnel these training classes could only reach a few children. Project Head Start hopes to reach all of them, white and Negro.

The average Memphis-Shelby County resident can't truly understand the need for preparing these youngsters for that first big step into formal education—the first grade.

For nearly all 6-year-olds, the first grade the first big venture away from mother, is an awesome experience. But for some, those from poverty-stricken or "culturally deprived" homes, it is a long journey across a dark void.

"Most of them have never had a box of crayons," said Louis Porter, principal of Pope Elementary School where a readiness program was set up last summer. Similar pro-

grams at individual schools were set up at Hamilton and Hanley Elementary Schools last year.

"Many live four blocks from the Mississippi River and have never seen it. They have never been to the zoo, although it is within walking distance.

"They have never had a pair of scissors in their hand. They have had no playthings like a ball. Never played an organized game or had any organized association with other children.

"The daily newspaper is a surprise to them. Not to read it, but just to see somebody reading one. It's unusual to have somebody react to them. Many of them have never heard music.

"They have never been concentrated on by adults. They have no idea how to take a page and turn it. They don't know which side is up. It's a big job for them just to learn how to sit in a desk."

Words, conversation—common experiences in many children's lives—are missing quantities in the life of an impoverished child, explained Mrs. Roberts, who guided the readiness program at her school.

"There is never anybody to sit down and carry on a conversation with them. The parents live very narrow lives. Their vocabularies are meager and so are the children's.

"I don't think people recognize what a tragic thing this is for a little child.

"It's the rockbottom people who are the worst. We polled the community around our school and really got those people at the bottom. And they were hard to get. They themselves don't know how important it is for the children.

"Some of those little ones were so withdrawn. They did not look like they lived in a world of people."

More than 90 percent of all the Memphis children who will be eligible to attend the project Head Start classes now live in densely populated poverty pockets, one big area along the Memphis waterfront from the Wolf River south to just north of Kerr and jutting east to Bellevue.

Two smaller pockets are along the Wolf River in North Memphis bordered on the south by the Louisville & Nashville Railroad.

Most of the families in the areas earn less than \$3,000 a year and many earn as little as \$1,000. Others earn next to nothing and are on welfare rolls. Often there are many children and a woman is the sole parent.

The 5-week preschool class at Hamilton took in 34 children. After 5 weeks of exploring their neighborhood, going to the zoo and the airport, playing games with other children and toys and doing a hundred things they had never done before, life was different for them, Mrs. Roberts said.

"Out of the 34, only 3 scored low enough on the readiness examination to be considered a poor risk for passing. If they hadn't come to the class half of them would have been a poor risk."

In Memphis schools 2 years ago, 1,433 first graders failed. That was only 12 percent of the total number of first graders, but it cost \$401,240 to send them back through the grade.

"The children with poor backgrounds come into class completely unequipped. They are just babies. They aren't ready to read, or do numbers or learn words because of a lack of contact with people," said Mrs. Roberts.

"By the time they are used to what is hap-

pening in class the year has gone. They are just getting used to sitting in a class.

"I think preschool training is more profound than just learning. The children have already been in the world long enough to have a concept of themselves—and it's not going to be very good.

"This (preschool training) does something for a child's self-concept. It does something to his thinking and it's bound to last. Then he can move on and be successful."

The Memphis-Shelby County application for funds won't come up for approval until some time in May.

If it is approved 7,170 children—6,000 in Memphis—will be eligible to attend 8-week classes in 83 schools in the city and county this summer.

The children, in the age group 5½ to 6, will be divided into classes of 15 students, each class with 1 teacher and 1 teacher assistant. Assistants may often be neighborhood mothers and not always with a college degree.

There will be little formal learning and the school day of 4 morning hours will be spent mostly in making field trips all over the city and county and becoming familiar with routine classroom procedure and materials.

Before the children start the summer session each will be given complete health and dental examinations and certain treatment if necessary. During the school period they will be given at least lunch and often breakfast for those to whom that meal is a rarity.

No program, no matter how large, can make budding scholars with only a breakfast and a trip to the zoo. But several thousand Memphis and Shelby County children will get a break—a head start—in the crowded race for education.

"If we didn't feel that we had some chance to win over their condition it would be bad," said Mrs. Roberts.

The preschool classes at both Pope and Hamilton kept the children together with the same teacher in the first grade, to give them continuity.

With the help of Project Head Start, if it is approved, the same teachers—and others in 83 schools—will be teaching their brothers, sisters, and friends.

## President Johnson's Johns Hopkins University Address on Vietnam

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, the Chattanooga Times recently published an excellent editorial in support of the President's address, at Johns Hopkins University, concerning Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, and I commend it to all Senators.

A2081



A2082

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 3, 1965

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## THE PRESIDENT'S PATH

President Johnson's masterly address in Baltimore, beamed to friend and foe alike, spelled out the two elements essential to the conduct of a responsible foreign policy: Power, with the willingness to use it; and principle, with its unyielding commitments and its continuing regard for human values.

They can bring us peace, the goal of all rational men; they can sustain us in any war necessary to defend freedom.

We are in Vietnam, he said, because we have given our word to help the South Vietnamese protect their right to choose their own path, "and I intend to keep that promise."

Our objective is fixed—an independent South Vietnam. Conditions for an ultimate settlement are clear—a nation "free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no other country."

For this purpose, he said, we remain ready "for unconditional discussions," the one really new point he defined in his recapitulation of our southeast Asia policy.

The enemy's objective is just as clear. North Vietnam whose "trained men, supplies, orders and arms" are the "heartbeat of the war," wants no less than the "total conquest" of its neighbor. And behind Hanoi is the "deepening shadow of Communist China" for whom the conflict is part of "a wider pattern of aggressive purpose."

We will use America's awesome power with restraint and wisdom, but "we will use it," to achieve a victory for freedom. We will not be defeated, or grow tired, or withdraw "either openly or under the cloak of meaningless agreement."

From this position of strength and determination, the President extended a hand to help and sounded a note of hope for a region sorely in need of both. Peace would permit a vast cooperative program of development, in which North Vietnam would share, he went on, and the United States would be asked to invest a billion dollars in the program under the aegis of the United Nations. Three years of military effort at the present level would cost us more.

In a particularly moving passage, Mr. Johnson said naked power is not the impressive thing in national policy or in human aspirations, although it may be necessary at times. A dam to produce power is impressive, he said. So is "a rich harvest in a hungry land," and the "sight of healthy children in a classroom."

"I know how difficult it is for reason to guide passion, and love to master hate," he said. "The complexities of this world do not bow easily to pure and consistent answers. But the simple truths are there just the same. We must try to follow them as best we can."

President Johnson makes it clear this is the path along which he would lead. And this Nation, as purposeful as it is powerful, as dedicated to principle as it is capable of military success, can follow him in unreserved support for his efforts to end the war in Vietnam or to fight it out to victory.

the world, friends of Poland or those slightly connected with this great country, have been celebrating Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791. Time and again we have discussed here on the floor of the House the merits of this great European charter as one of the most democratic constitutional documents ever drafted. Unfortunately, for well over a century, the people of Poland were unable to benefit from it, for as we all well know, the country was partitioned by three great powers: Russia, Prussia, and Austria. For barely 20 years of full independence, between the two Great Wars were the Polish people able to enjoy their freedom, their liberty, and their way of life, guaranteed them by this Constitution.

After 20 years of full liberty, the independent Polish nation was once again invaded. On the one hand bloodthirsty armies of Hitler's Third Reich crossed the Polish frontiers and within 1 month had the entire country in complete control, murdering or executing all opposition. On the other hand Hitler's allies, the Soviet Union, marched into Poland from the East and within 3 months of its occupation deported some 1½ million people, who were shipped to the farthest regions of the U.S.S.R. and put into the infamous slave labor camps. More than 14,000 Polish officers were massacred by the NKVD, and in the years that followed the Soviet occupation of Polish soil, some 2 million Poles disappeared, never to be accounted for, bringing the total of Poles slaughtered to some 7 million souls.

In July of this year the Polish puppet regime will loudly celebrate the 21st anniversary of Poland's "liberation," one of the most tragic events history has known. This Polish tragedy has no comparison, and some specific examples of how it came about and is maintained are worth keeping in mind.

On July 22, 1944, a handful of unknown people who called themselves the Committee of Liberation formed a new Polish Government in Lublin, backed up by Stalin's Red Army and the NKVD. The Polish Home Army was being liquidated, and a few unknown members of underground units who came into Poland with the Soviet army were made heroes overnight. Half of Poland was handed over to Stalin, and the deal was accepted by the three great powers. Alien to Poland, hordes of Communist Gauleiters took over the country, throwing into jail everyone who openly opposed the Soviet-inspired action.

Poland, which has only one party, the Communist Party, has its movements called PAX. Its leader, Stanislaw Piasecki, a prewar Fascist who headed the ultranationalist Falanga Party, leads today the pseudo-Catholic movement, the aim of which is to split the Polish Catholics and undermine them from within. Piasecki, who managed to split the Polish clergy by forming an anti-Vatican priesthood of the so-called patriotic priests, is the only Pole in Poland who manages to run his own free enterprise organization—profitmaking stores, small industry, and an export house known as "Inco," not to speak of a chain of the so-called Catholic press which fully supports the Red regime with all its crimi-

nal elements. None of the various PAX establishments pays any income tax. How this highly controversial character, who until 1939 advocated "a free-of-Jews Polish Nationalist Home," came back into a Communist-run country is no mystery to those who know a little about the workings of the Kremlin. After having been arrested by the NKVD, Piasecki, a highly intelligent individual, managed to convince Sverov, Beria's deputy, that his PAX movement would achieve the Soviet aim, to split the Poles. He was released and aided in getting back to Poland, where his power today is unlimited.

And now, the latest twist by the regime which calls itself a democracy: Last March the Wroclaw Weekly, of the PAX group Catholics, published an interview with General Berling, chairman of the Polonia Committee, an organization aiming to bring closer ties with Poles abroad. Berling, asked by the correspondent about the tasks of the recently-created Polonia Committee attached to the Union of Fighters for Freedom and Democracy, had this to say:

The tasks are very important and very fundamental. We want to establish permanent contacts with the Polonia centers throughout the world. First of all, we would like to establish contacts with the Polish veterans' organizations abroad. We would then enable our countrymen living abroad to become acquainted with the real life of Poland, with its great achievements and its great plans for the future.

The real scope of the Polonia Committee was shown by the following words:

We would like to draw the Polonia into the all-national front of building up the prestige of our Fatherland and of maintaining vigilance against everything which threatens Poland with hostility. . . . We envisage the organization of common political activity aimed, for instance, at unmasking the revisionist drives of antipeace elements. . . . We shall organize celebrations of the national anniversaries of great historical events; care for the places where Polish blood was shed during the last war. We shall organize an exchange of periodicals and publications containing integral information, excursions, visits of emigre families to Poland, summer holidays in Poland for children from abroad, etc.

On the day of the 174th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, I would like to ask the chairman of the Polonia Committee whether his committee is going to celebrate this great day. I would like to ask him whether his committee will care for all the places where Polish blood was shed—will it include the Katyn Forest? I would like to ask why, in a recent visa application form issued by all Polish consulates, he has included the following question, which speaks for itself and understandably may give pause to emigre families hoping to visit Poland:

In case of earlier permanent residency in Poland, give the last address, place of work, and position, when and on what grounds and by what documents the departure followed?

And finally, I would like to ask the chairman of the Polonia Committee whether he realizes that the hostility of Poles abroad is directed, not against Poland, the Polish nation, and what the Poles stand for, but merely against a re-

## Polish Constitution Day

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, for 174 years now all free people throughout

May 3, 1965

A2089

the loss of our rights—and a poor bargain it is. Our subsidy—less than \$200 last year—naturally helps, but it doesn't make a critical difference to a family that's been on a pay-as-you-go basis as long as we have. As long as businessmen who denounce Government accept subsidies to their industries, and as long as artists denounce the organization man and accept foundation grants, so also will we continue to accept the Government's money, and go right on trying to bite the hand that feeds us.

But the Federal controls do worry us. If the Government can dictate what we can plant, is it not conceivable that someday the Government will be able to forbid us to farm our 151 acres of rabbit tracks at all?

### From Vietnam: A Letter to Dallas

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. EARLE CABELL**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention of the House to a very warm and moving letter from a young man who is serving our country in Saigon. This letter appeared in the April 29 issue of the Dallas Times Herald along with an article by Jim Lehrer. This young man tells a story which needs to be told again and again so that our people realize what we are fighting in Vietnam.

President Johnson has emphasized many times that the reason we are in South Vietnam is to halt the bombings and murder of South Vietnamese men, women, and children by the Vietcong who are directed from Hanoi. The South Vietnamese are brave and courageous people. They have suffered casualties at rates higher than we have ever experienced in our history. However, this young man says more than I can say about the wisdom of supporting President Johnson's policies in Vietnam.

The above mentioned follows:

FROM VIETNAM: A LETTER TO DALLAS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter was received by the Times Herald from Bobby Dalton, a Dallas man now stationed with the U.S. Navy in Vietnam.)

To: Managing Editor, Dallas Times Herald.  
From: Bobby Dalton, GmG3, U.S. Navy.  
Subject: Vietnam.

Sir: I realize that this letter may seem silly to you, but I would like to tell you something that I've observed while in Vietnam.

I am a sailor stationed here for 2 years. The normal tour is one year, but I extended an additional year. For the first time in my life I feel that I'm helping accomplish something. People who live in the United States don't know how lucky they are. Some just don't care what happens in this country.

The only thing is, this is the time to stop retreating for the sake of the Communists.

I do not ever want to see a war like we will be faced with. It would be horrible. But then I say stop letting the Communists push us. They openly send arms and troops into this country to overthrow the present government. Then because Americans come here to help at the request of the government of Vietnam we are called aggressors. If you could meet some of the people here

you would understand better. They have fought the Viet Minh and now it is the Vietcong. This has lasted for more than 10 years. Some of the people don't care any more. Sending of sons to fight and maybe get killed seems only natural.

They make a big thing of it when an American is killed or wounded. But the United States just does not realize how many Vietnamese are killed or disabled daily here.

Sir, I saw the American Embassy 5 minutes after the bomb exploded. Anyone who objects to our policy in this country should have seen it. I truly believe they would change their mind. When that car exploded it was as effective as firing 00 buckshot into a crowded room. These were not soldiers killed here. Most of them were civilians, women and children, also.

What has to happen to wake people up to this threat? It will not end here. If this country falls, then will come the next and the next.

Sir, I'm not a crackpot or crazy. It is just that I never realized what was happening until I saw it firsthand. I hope that my younger brother and sister who are 16 and 6 never have to go through what these people do.

I've finished letting off a little steam. I'm sorry if I bothered you too much. I am a resident of Dallas and my mother lives there. I want to see my family again as do all servicemen here want to go home.

I hope President Johnson sticks to his guns because he is right.

Sincerely yours,

BOBBY C. DALTON,  
GmG3 Headquarters Support Activity.  
SAIGON.

(By Jim Lehrer, staff writer)

Bobby Dalton's mother isn't surprised that her son wrote a letter to the Times Herald from Vietnam.

"He's a sensitive, sincere boy who speaks when he has something to say," said Mrs. Alva Dalton, Wednesday.

A switchboard operator at the downtown YMCA, Mrs. Dalton said her 22-year-old-son has had a lot to say about the war in Vietnam.

"After the bombing of the American Embassy in Saigon 4 weeks went by without a letter \* \* \* and then finally one came," she recalled.

Mrs. Dalton said Bobby told of being close by the Embassy and racing to the scene immediately.

"He said he counted 15 bodies and he picked up a girl and carried her out. She died before he could get her to an ambulance."

"Mother, I actually tracked out human blood," she quoted her son as writing.

Mrs. Dalton said Bobby's sensitivity, in fact, may eventually end his career in the Navy, which began 3 years ago.

"As a result of his experiences at the Embassy and elsewhere in Vietnam his blood pressure has risen," she said. "The Navy may not let him re-enlist because of it."

Bobby was born in Corpus Christi, said Mrs. Dalton, but grew up in Chandler and Tyler. He finished the 11th grade at Chandler High School and then went on to get his high school diploma in the Navy.

Mrs. Dalton and two of her other children, Alva, Jr., 15, and Joanna, 6, moved to Dallas 3 years ago. They live at 530 Sunnyside in Cockrell Hill. Alva is a student at Crozier Tech High School.

Mrs. Dalton said Bobby has kept her well informed—except for that one 4-week break—with letters and pictures from Vietnam.

"He never goes anywhere without a camera or two," she said. "He's sent us many photographs and even two reels of movies he has taken over there."

His affinity for writing, she said, he just picked up on his own.

"He's always been a bookworm. He reads everything."

She is, of course, anxious for her son to come home. So is Joanna, the little sister. Asked Wednesday, how long her brother had been gone, the girl sighed:

"Weeks and weeks and weeks \* \* \* I don't know when he's coming home."

### Polish Constitution Day

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, is a very important document. Its adoption and promulgation marked a turning point in Poland's Central Government, and the date has become a Polish holiday.

The Polish people had the misfortune of losing a good part of their country late in the 1770's to their greedy neighbors. Certain Polish leaders felt that if they had a strong central government, capable of uniting all elements in the country and strengthening its fighting capacity, future calamities could be avoided. They were thoroughly dissatisfied with their absolutist, monarchical form of government. The king had too much power, and was incapable of using it effectively because of certain crippling defects in the old Diet—legislative assembly. The discontent was widespread among liberal leaders and also among the mass of the people. These liberal, democratic and patriotic leaders took upon themselves the task of drawing up a constitution which would improve, if not revolutionize, the Government of Poland. The result was the Constitution of May 3, 1791.

The Constitution drastically reduced the arbitrary powers of the king, and made Poland a constitutional monarchy. Heretofore the king could exercise his authority only through a council. The powers of the upper chamber were curtailed, and those of the popularly elected lower chamber were strengthened. The peasantry was freed from its bondage and placed under the protection of the law. Religious toleration was assured to all citizens, and freedom of speech was guaranteed. These features made the Constitution a democratic instrument and represented a great forward advance in popularizing the Government. It was hailed as such throughout the country, and even many liberal leaders abroad praised the Polish leaders.

On the 174th anniversary celebration of the Polish Constitution Day one can hardly overlook the 25th anniversary of the Katyn Forest massacre of many thousand Polish officers by their heartless captors early in the last war. Incidentally, in this connection, it is also worth recalling that this is the 20th anniversary of the Yalta agreement. Lastly, I would also like to stress the fact that almost 1,000 years ago, in the year



May 3, 1965

A2090

966, Poles adopted Christianity as their faith and founded the most powerful Christian power in eastern Europe. In taking note of all these occasions, I gladly join all friends of Poland and of freedom.

### Must Papers Be Grim? A Chuckle Would Help

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, no newspaper column receives more careful attention by people in public life than the weekly column of John S. Knight.

That distinguished editor covers the national and international scene with great forthrightness. He constantly treats his subjects with the deep seriousness that they merit.

As Jack Knight is a fellow townsman of mine, it has been my privilege to spend many wonderful hours in his company. I have found him to be a truly dedicated, patriotic citizen but one who has always maintained a good sense of humor. He has never assumed the mantle of a pontificating editor. He has ever retained that quality of fellowship that has characterized the great editors of our Nation.

The John S. Knight column, not only appeared in his own newspapers, the Akron, Ohio, Beacon Journal; the Miami, Fla., Herald; the Detroit, Mich., Free Press; the Charlotte, N.C., Observer; and the Tallahassee, Fla., Democrat but in over 100 other newspapers as well.

It follows;

#### MUST PAPERS BE GRIM? A CHUCKLE WOULD HELP

(By John S. Knight)

The Nation's editors journeyed to Washington a few weeks ago to brush up on journalistic techniques and hear from the mighty men of Government who regulate our daily lives.

On the whole, it was not an illuminating experience. Other than a panel on civil rights sparked by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, the program was dull, uninformative and humorless.

Vermont C. Royster, editor of the Wall Street Journal and newly elected president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, found the discussions of journalism—past and future—"dreadfully depressing."

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, who can ordinarily manage a fast quip or two, delivered himself of a Democratic stump speech which I feared would never end. Later, HUBERT HORATIO had the grace to apologize to the program chairman for laying an egg.

Henry Fowler, the new Secretary of the Treasury, said nothing in a good many words. The same applied to Commerce Secretary Connor. As "Bunny" Royster remarked: "You could have switched one speech for the other and nobody would have known the difference."

Admittedly, oratory is a dying art. Yet a man should get more for the price of his luncheon ticket than chicken, peas, melting ice cream and cold coffee.

It was enough to drive an editor back to the bar and his racing form to bone up on the Kentucky Derby.

The suspicion lurks, however, that if any important Government pronouncements are to be made, L.B.J. will make them. So the public relations boys—and every Federal bureaucrat has them in depth—protect their immediate bosses with prepared speeches which have about as much zing as an over-ventured martini served in a warm glass.

Happily for the ASNE, President Vermont Connecticut Royster is a North Carolina boy with a sense of humor. His parents must have had it, too. So, as the Republicans used to say, just wait until next year.

In these days of grim headlines and sad stories depicting the ills of humanity, editors should strive for a better mix. I learned that word last week at a shopping center press party when the owner referred repeatedly to the proper tenant mix.

I gathered it meant that an efficiently planned center should have something in it to please every customer. Like a newspaper, perhaps?

Today's press is certainly cheating the reader in the humor department. Our editors have strong views on Vietnam, mental health, juvenile delinquency, the imbalance of payments, world government, the United Nations, civil rights, and the John Birch Society.

Yet there is precious little in our newspapers to make a man laugh. And he wants to, you know.

I read an amusing story the other day about a St. Bernard dog, the kind that wears a cask of brandy around his neck and saves mountain climbers in the Alps. This particular dog couldn't climb his way out of a dry swimming pool, so the owners had to call upon the fire department to make the rescue.

Not too funny, perhaps, but better reading than the spate of stories about rapes, murders, and accidents which confront us with increasing number and regularity.

Today, every writer wants to be a pundit and deal only with significant news. This is the age of the specialist in journalism, and so we have them in politics, government, education, science, social welfare, and the cultural arts.

It is a trend I do not decry. Newspaper readers are better informed today than ever before. Reporters and special writers have the background and the ability to make involved subjects readable and understandable. Through investigative reporting, they disclose chicanery, corruption, and incompetency wherever it may exist.

Your daily newspaper is the public's best protection against the excesses of government at all levels. It is not unmindful of the growing interest in art, the theater, and the beautification of our cities. The newspaper is a superbly packaged compendium of the things which interest you.

And yet, I sense the need for more warmth in our pages and the humorous feature stories which sparkle like stars in an otherwise forbidding night.

The popularity of sports pages gives testimony to the fact that we are all, in a sense, escapists. Few there are who have no heroes in the world of sports. Breathes there a man with soul so dead who does not revel in the golfing exploits of Jack Nicklaus or a lady who has never read of Kelso, the wonder horse of this generation?

Of course, there are also humorous aspects to the news which rival "Today's Chuckle."

Barry Goldwater, for instance, presented himself to the Anglo-American Press Association in Paris by saying: "If you don't know who I am, I'm the trigger-happy, war-mongering SOB who has been asking the administration to do something about the supply routes in North Vietnam. Now, you're a statesman when you do that."

Or my friend Don Maxwell, editor of the Chicago Tribune, who has called upon Fidel Castro to confess his errors, renounce communism on May 1 and join the free world.

Editor Maxwell said in an open letter to Castro: "Repent. Make good your promise to the people. The Chicago Tribune will publish your May Day confession in full."

To date, the Cuban dictator has not replied to this generous inducement. Perhaps Fidel is holding out for the editor's job.

The histrionic performances of EVERETT DIRKSEN, Senate minority leader, are always good entertainment. The U.S. News & World Report asked him recently: "Some polls report that a large share of the people regard the Republican Party as the party of big business. Do you think that's true?"

DIRKSEN replied: "Well, now. How interesting that Henry Ford and his associates on tax matters all joined up as a committee for Mr. Johnson last year. They were all Republicans, but went over to the Democrats."

"Now if big business is an odious tag, the Democrats have got it. But Henry will be back in my office when the bill to cut excise taxes comes up."

And then comes Mr. George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, who says unions should be prepared to use strikes or boycotts to force employer compliance with a new Federal ban on job discrimination against Negroes.

Why is this funny? Well, simply because some of the unions which Mr. Meany presumably controls have long been notorious discriminators against Negro applicants for membership.

Finally, I read somewhere that U.S. war correspondents in South Vietnam are barred from entering the PX's and officers' clubs but that the shapely ladies of Saigon are always welcome.

It seems the reporters cannot be trusted to print the truth, but the girls are considered loyal to the cause.

The item is not amusing but it shows how far bureaucracy will go to louse up a war.

Some days the news is pretty depressing and a fellow would like to get away from it all.

Yet Charlie O., the mule mascot of the Kansas City Athletics is hammering it up, green fairways beckon the ardent golfer who practiced putting on the living room rug all winter and the bum predictions on the Kentucky Derby are still good for a laugh.

Richard Monckton Milnes once said: "The sense of humor is the just balance of all the faculties of man, the best security against the pride of knowledge and the conceits of the imagination, the strongest inducement to submit with a wise and pious patience to the vicissitudes of human existence."

In a word, humor helps and we need more of it.

### This Is What I Firmly Believe

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George P. Smith, of the Cuyahoga River Reclamation Commission, Cuyahoga Falls, Ohio, is one of the most sincere and devoted conservationists of the Nation. John Smith has spent a lifetime of effort in attempting to arrest the pollution of our streams and waterways located in the Buckeye State.

Recently, Mr. Smith has authored the following lines entitled "This Is What I